

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 3.—JULY, 1895.

I.

DOCTRINE FOR THE PULPIT.

* BY REV. EML. V. GERHART, D.D., LL.D.

THE pulpit has been created for a distinct and specific purpose: distinct, inasmuch as it differs in kind from the public discourse which becomes the political platform, or the forum, or the legislative hall, or the lyceum; specific, being an institution ordained and empowered by Jesus Christ, as the chief agency for the founding, the maintenance and the growth of His spiritual kingdom.

Ordained by Jesus Christ, both the subject-matter and the purpose of the pulpit are also by Him ordained; and the wisdom of the institution becomes evident in the degree that it recognizes its motive and with fidelity performs the work assigned to it.

The prescribed end at which by its author the pulpit is bound to aim is twofold; the edification of believers, and the conversion of the world to Christ. Neither may take precedence. Fidelity to the one requires fidelity to the other. Neither end can be accomplished according to the mind of Christ if the other be ignored or falsely subordinated.

In the apostolic age the conversion of Jews and Gentiles to the faith of Christ was the principal aim of preaching; yet immediately connected with the conversion of Jews and Gentiles, and as the necessary consequence of it, was the necessity of imparting correct knowledge respecting all the essential facts of Christianity and of cultivating among believers the distinctive qualities of Christian character. This order in fulfilling the purposes of preaching continued throughout the formative period of the Church, when necessarily the primary object was to bring about the conversion of men and women, and thus secure for the Church an existence in the cities of the Roman Empire.

But after the Church was established in Palestine, Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, and in other countries, especially after the conversion of Constantine, at the beginning of the fourth century, when Christianity became the authorized religion of the State, this order was by the force of circumstances reversed. The matter of chief importance, and therefore claiming first attention, was the instruction of believers in the knowledge of the Christian religion. The territorial extension of the kingdom and the conversion of Pagan nations held a secondary place. This change in the order of performing the twofold work of the pulpit has been perpetual through the ages down to our day.

Nor is the pulpit open to criticism for this change in the order of fulfilling its twofold purpose, provided that both purposes be emphasized in due proportion. The thing which, agreeably to the teachings of the New Testament, is and always must be the principal concern of the Church is, not the number, but the quality of her membership. It is above all things requisite that the ministry and the laity be thoroughly instructed in the knowledge of the religion of Christ, and that they exemplify the distinguishing morality of the Christian faith, which works by love. This is the fundamental obligation. A pure, intelligent, scriptural faith and that righteousness of Christian character which is the fruit of the Holy Spirit condition both the genuineness and the efficiency of missionary zeal and all missionary labors.

The most efficient agency by which sound knowledge is to be promoted and Christian character is to be built up is the pulpit. To preach and teach Christian truth is pre-eminently the divine calling of a Christian minister. In other words, the pulpit is ordained solely for the proclamation and defence of the Gospel; and the contents of the proclamation consist in the mysteries of the Christian Creed. Of these mysteries the person of Jesus Christ is central, imparting vitality and saving virtue to all others. To proclaim Christ and the realities of His kingdom implies that the preacher has a correct conception of Christ; and a correct conception constitutes Christian doctrine. An approved manner of apprehending and holding an objective fact of the Christian Creed is the doctrine concerning it.

As when the pulpit proclaims the facts of Christianity agreeably to the word of God, this proclamation is made in the form of sound doctrine, so when church members receive and intelligently appropriate Christian truth as proclaimed by the pulpit, they receive it and know it in the form of sound doctrine. For doctrine is none other than a scriptural form in which the mind lays hold of and possesses Christian truth. Doctrine is a necessity. There is no other mode in which the living facts of Christianity can either be rationally declared by the ministry, or rationally received and held by the membership. If the people have no doctrinal apprehension of Christian truth they may have some slight perception of it, but they have no knowledge of the truth.

A perception of the truth they may have and some impression of its spiritual excellence, but the perception, if not unfolded into knowledge is dim, and remains indefinite, and the impression amounts to no more than an uncertain and changeful sentiment. Knowledge is a rational possession. So long as the will and the intelligence do not embrace and possess the truth the believer will at most be only a babe in Christ.

Christian truth addresses the whole man; not the reason or the intelligence by itself in the form of a cold, logical proposition; not the will in the form of mandatory authority; not the

feelings in the form of manifold appeals to our emotional nature; but truth addresses man's personality; and in personality, will, reason and feeling, however diverse their functions may be, are a unity. In virtue of a common personal life neither function of the soul is active without affecting the other functions.

Moreover, no function of personality can in scientific thought be divorced from the others without prejudice to the science of psychology; nor can either function be addressed by the pulpit regardless of its vital connection with the other functions, without producing error in conception or malformation of character.

We may distinguish three modes of a defective proclamation of the gospel. One defective method looks upon Christianity as a body of doctrines, revealed by God and taught by inspiration in Holy Scripture, or a series of truthful propositions respecting God and man, Jesus Christ and salvation from sin, propositions which are to be intellectually apprehended and inculcated and defended. The authority of God's law for the conscience may not be denied nor obscured, nor may the propriety of sincere devotion to truth fail of recognition. But the obligation of law in the first instance refers to the maintenance of sound doctrine, and devotion to Christ consists chiefly in zeal for some particular doctrinal system.

Another defective method emphasizes the legal aspect of revealed truth. It regards Christianity mainly as a law which binds the conscience of the believer to the keeping of the Sabbath, to regular attendance at church, the observance of the sacraments, the giving of alms, and obedience to all other commands peculiar to Christianity. The importance of sound Christian doctrine and of personal consecration to the kingdom of God may indeed not be forgotten, but sound doctrine pertains rather to orthodox opinions on the commandments of God and Christian ordinances, than to ideas concerning the nativity and personal history, the resurrection, glorification and second advent of the Son of Man; and feeling is not so much the warmth of consecration to Jesus Christ for His own sake, for the excellence

and glory of His Name, as it is the experience of zealous interest in the regular performance of these Christian duties.

A third defective method lays chief stress on our emotional nature, the excitement of feeling being regarded as the spring of Christian zeal and Christian activity.

The pulpit proceeds on the assumption that Christianity and Christian institutions are the best instrumentality, on the one hand, for the deliverance from present and future misery, on the other hand, for the promotion of man's happiness in this world and in the world to come. It is assumed that the great end, here as well as hereafter, for which man was created and continues to exist, for which the Christian religion has been instituted, and towards which all the dealings of Providence are directed, is the well-being of our race.

Proceeding on the basis of the emotional method the importance of sound doctrine and the necessity of obedience to the divine will may apparently be duly honored. But the honor is only apparent. The knowledge of Christian truth is held subordinate to human happiness. From its connection with man's well-being knowledge derives its value. Obedience to the divine law is necessary because obedience conditions present and future happiness. The value of the knowledge of Christian truth consists in showing us the only true way of attaining to happiness. The law is needful in order to guard us against the by-paths of sin and thus protect us against its misery. God has ordained the conditions on which happiness depends, and the law enjoins and enforces these conditions.

Of these defective methods to which the pulpit is exposed it is safe to say that the one-sided emotional method is in the ascendant among the various denominations of our country. Both the necessity of sound doctrine and the authority of law, each on its own account, have receded, and if I do not misread the signs of the time doctrine and law are still receding. Jesus Christ is appreciated, not principally for His ideal excellence, but for the reason that He is the person who is the deliverer from the sorrow and misery of our earthly state, and at death

takes His followers to Himself amid the glories of heaven. The Church is an important institution, not chiefly because she is the mystical body of Christ, her Head, in which He is ever living by His Holy Spirit, but because by her moral influence and her means of grace she promotes the well-being of the family and of the community.

Silently influenced and largely controlled by the emotional sentiment the predominant aim of the pulpit in many denominations is to awaken and stimulate and maintain interest in religion and the Church by addressing, not the rational life, nor the moral life, nor the conscience, but by chiefly addressing feeling, that is, the hopes, the fears, the love of excitement or the morbid hunger for sensationalism, in a word, the selfishness of the congregation. For this purpose the facts in the life of Jesus Christ, especially His death, may be impressively set forth. If the facts of His personal history do not serve the controlling purpose, then very often resort is taken to other matters, to the marvellous discoveries of natural science, or to some of the wonderful events of secular history, or the anecdotes occurring in the history of distinguished men and notable women, whether of the political or religious world, or to some tragic scenes of common life, or to some remarkable cases of religious experience. If these resources fail, then in many congregations the ingenuity of pastor and people is taxed for some novel device by which to create a sensation and draw crowds to the church, it may be some celebrated opera-singer to delight the ear or some beautiful pictorial representation to rivet the eye.

It goes without saying that to the degree in which the emotional system may prevail in any branch of the Church or in any particular congregation, it sharpens the appetite for more and more of the emotional food; and this desire for an emotional stimulus soon develops into a longing for the sensational. And the desire for the sensational begets a distaste for sound doctrinal instruction, a distaste for moral truth and addresses to the conscience. That this is the natural result of the emo-

tional system is shown by many facts of our own day. Some members of the Church or of the community invent one novel or extraordinary device after another in order to satisfy an unsatisfied morbid craving after excitement. Another class of people is atrophied by emotional measures and turns away from the pulpit with a sense of displeasure, many of whom long for something better, higher, nobler to meet their spiritual needs, but know not in what direction to turn.

This statement it is not necessary to establish or illustrate by examples. Few persons will challenge its correctness. The demand for the emotional and the sensational not only prevails, but it is growing. The pulpit is yielding to the demand, not indeed universally, for there are notable and significant exceptions. There are denominations which in part or as a whole are resisting the tendency. And among those in which the sensational spirit is in the ascendant there are many ministers that maintain a firm stand against it. Nevertheless it is correct to say that sensationalism is a characteristic of the churches of our time; and it is invading some denominations that hitherto have discerned its poisonous influence, and have resisted its approach.

The unavoidable consequence is that to the extent that the emotional system ignores the necessity and spiritual worth of doctrinal teaching church-members lack biblical knowledge, firmness of belief, solidity of character, clearness and consistency of Christian judgment. Enthusiasm has indeed a necessary place in the life of a believer, but if enthusiasm is not kindled by Christian truth it lacks principle and wisdom; if not anchored on sound doctrine it lacks stability and therefore is unreliable, and "when tribulation or persecution arises because of the word, straightway they stumble." There may be, from the impulses of feeling, much practical activity, but if activity is not quickened by an intelligent and fixed consecration to Christ for Christ's sake, the reigning motives of religious service will be humanitarian rather than Christian. Sooner or later, Christian activity, by degenerating into the

mind and character of worldliness, will lose the Christian element.

Some signs of a reaction may be seen in different quarters ; though it is questionable whether the reaction clearly understands itself, and is moving away from the secular habit toward the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus. The Church does not need a different Gospel, nor a different interpretation of Christianity. The Church does not need any inventive genius to prescribe novel agencies, nor the discovery of some expedient by which natural science or the productions of art or business methods, may be so utilized as to impart freshness and attraction to the pulpit. Those who look for relief or spiritual advantage along such lines betray the virus of the humanitarian spirit which is permeating the prevalent emotionalism.

All needful resources and effectual remedies are at hand in the legitimate vocation of the pulpit. Let the pulpit be faithful to its own Christian idea and mission. It has a peculiar mission, a mission which no other institution shares. Let the pulpit proclaim the truth, whether men of the world or members of the Church will hear it or reject it. Proclaim the unique facts of Christianity intelligently, clearly, under the anointing and in the demonstration of the Holy Spirit. If proclaimed conformably to the apostolic pattern, Christianity will demonstrate itself to be fresh, attractive, mighty in the experience of every man whom our Lord in the parable of the sower represents by the "good ground." His heart will be open to things both new and old. Christ teaches that every minister of the gospel who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man who is a householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old. Let the pulpit without hesitation confine itself to this spiritual function, proclaiming the "old" with fresh insight into its transcendent worth and beauty, and bringing to light "new" truth from the hidden depths of an infinite revelation. The genuine gospel is as powerful to-day as it was in the apostolic age. The living truth which fills it is the antidote, as nicely adjusted to the

needs of our worldly-minded and covetous age as when the first evangelical sermon was preached by Peter on the day of Pentecost. Christianity has as much fitness to touch the heart, to rivet attention and awaken confidence in itself, as when Paul stood before the cultured Athenians on Mars Hill, when a few believed and many mocked.

The chief requisite is clear insight into the spiritual worth and the supreme might of the gospel, a worth with which no beauty of literature, no facts of science, no hypothesis of philosophy, no production of art, no phenomenon of history is comparable; a might whose incisive, transforming, uplifting action no hostile combination of unbelievers can stay, no indifference of the "mind of the flesh" can neutralize, no diabolical enmity can crush or withstand. Put the gospel to a fair test. As when Christ was preaching the kingdom in Judea and Galilee, so now there may be three different kinds of soil on which the seed of the word falls, without bringing forth fruit to perfection. But the failure does not demonstrate either that the "seed" has no heavenly life nor that there is no soil on which the seed can take root and bear fruit a hundredfold. If there be three to one who count themselves unworthy of eternal life, it is unmistakably true nevertheless that there is one class out of four who "hear the word, and accept it," and bring forth the fruit of Christian righteousness. It is the "good ground" that demonstrates the new creating virtue of Jesus Christ. Such self-demonstration, however, is impossible unless it be the genuine seed of the word that is sown upon the soil of the human heart.

I make no plea for a return to the formal intellectualism which characterized many pulpits during the first decades of the present century. The understanding was addressed rather than the will; and the will was addressed on the basis of God's authority and in the character of obligation, rather than in the sympathy of divine love—a style of preaching which may have been needful and in many respects wisely adapted to the moral condition of society and the status of the Church then existing.

Whether it was wise or unwise, whether effective or not, that method has had its day, and it has served its purpose. It cannot be, nor ought it to be, resuscitated. The wide-spread religious emotionalism of the last sixty years is, in one view, an unavoidable reaction against it. But the pendulum of reaction has swung too far towards the opposite point of the arc. Not only has it carried the churches into a demoralizing error directly the opposite of abstract intellectualism, but it has also eliminated the valuable elements of wisdom that imparted a genuine spiritual tone, Christian reverence and dignity to that discarded style.

Those elements of wisdom were the great truths respecting *God*, His sovereign authority, His infinite hatred of sin, His wise government of the world; respecting *man*, his inherited sinfulness, his guilt, his subjection to the curse of death, his absolute need of redemption through the mediatorship of Jesus Christ; and respecting the *Holy Spirit*, by whom alone sinful men can be born into the kingdom of God, by whose agency alone, through the word, faith in Christ is quickened, the growth of the new life is nourished, and sanctification progresses. These and cognate elements of the Christian revelation need to be reasserted, but at the same time modified and perfected by those Christological ideas, which are now coming to be generally recognized. What do the churches need? The only answer is Christian truth, neither more nor less. They are yearning after it; some consciously, many more unconsciously. They are restive from a sense of thirst for the water of life; yet scores are searching for it in earthly cisterns instead of going to the fountain. Christian truth the churches need, as it is set forth by the Gospels and Epistles of the New Testament. Needed it is by all classes; by our church-going and non-church-going populations. But all classes need the Christian truth taught by the New Testament, in the forms of speech in vogue to-day, adjusted to the changed moral and social conditions of the various classes of men and women now challenging the wisdom of the pulpit.

To preach and teach Christian truth, adjusted to the moral and religious demands of our time, requires the enthronement of sound doctrine in place of sensational devices—for the ignorant and depraved classes as certainly as for law-abiding citizens. A legitimate enthronement of sound doctrine, I may repeat, does not mean remote speculations, or erudite discourses, or critical disquisitions on the inspiration or the correct text of Holy Scripture. It means an intelligent, earnest, sympathetic proclamation of the facts, the realities of the Christian Creed, a proclamation animated and elevated by undoubted faith in Jesus Christ and devout consecration to the honor of His kingdom.

II.

THE STATE AND RELIGION.

BY REV. J. S. STAHR, D.D.

- ✓ MAN is truly human only as he lives in society. The processes both of nature and history tend to develop perfected individuality; but at the same time there is a development of the social condition of individuals and the tendency to form a perfected society in the same degree that the individual type advances to a higher stage. This fact—a fact of common experience—would seem to show that humanity in both aspects is subject to the same law of development; but this is far from expressing the whole truth in the case. The individual and society are not only subject to the same law of development, and keep pace in their progress from stage to stage of civilization and culture, but they also depend upon and mutually condition each other's development. Anthropologists of a certain class have been accustomed to assume that human history and development began with primitive men in the form of a solitary or isolating animal. History of course knows nothing of such a condition. Every stage of human life of which we have the faintest record presupposes the social condition. But it has been said that the solitary stage must necessarily have preceded the social stage, as atoms precede molecules and organic structure. The truth is, however, that the assumption cannot be proved, that the assumption is not necessary, and that the analogies of nature are against it. The higher animals live in family groups, more or less strictly maintained, even if there is no manifestation of gregariousness on a larger scale. Much more are family groups and the association of larger bodies of individuals required by the physical conditions of human life.

And if the physical conditions require a social state for the proper maintenance of human life, the intellectual and moral attributes upon which human progress depends, cannot be conceived of as having any force or significance, except as manifested and operative in the bosom of society. The possession of these traits proves that the social condition is natural for man. But more than this, all the knowledge we have of the laws which underlie man's intellectual and moral development goes to show that every successive step taken in either direction is dependent upon and conditioned by a social environment already at hand. If, therefore, it is asserted that the body of man had its genesis away back in the animal kingdom, and that his intellectual and moral nature is based on traits possessed by the animal also—assertions with which we are all familiar—we can only say that the processes by which man became what he now is, must of necessity antedate all human history. Man is man only in society, that is when he lives with his fellow-men, in relations of a distinctly intellectual and moral kind, under conditions which make room for intelligence and freedom both in the individual and in society.

As we follow history backward toward the beginning of human society, its organization becomes simpler and more elementary. There is, however, no stage in which we find simple aggregation instead of organization. Reaching away back into the most distant ages of antiquity there are, besides the family (which is necessarily required for the perpetuation of the generic life of the race), two institutions which are so intimately interwoven in all human history, and so constantly operative in the realization of the social idea, that they may be said to be prime factors in all human development. These are government and religion, or the state and the church. The latter two terms express in a concrete form the organization of society in what we may call institutions, by means of which certain definite aspects of human life come to view, and provision is made for meeting the elementary and essential requirements of human progress. The former two are broader and more rudimentary, expressing in less

definitely organized form the same forces or factors which ultimately crystallize into the latter. We can conceive of a social condition so simple that it does not involve an organized state or a church; but not of one destitute of government or of religion. Wherever men live socially there must be some form of government by which the mass becomes a unity, an organism, however simple and primitive in structure it may be. Whether the governing power be in the hands of one, of a few, or of all, there must, in the nature of the case, be a seat of authority somewhere. In the same way we may conceive of men living without an organized, visible church or religious system. In fact, the word church is of modern origin and is used in the narrow sense with special reference to Christianity. But it is also applied to Judaism, and in the broad sense, as when we distinguish between the state and the church, it will apply without inconsistency or violence to any definitely organized religious body. But if we do not always find a church or definitely organized religious system, we *do* find, in every stage of human development, the germs of religious belief and worship which necessarily crystallize into a definite religious system as society advances. The reason is plain,* "Human nature has a Godward and a manward side. As a person man sustains relations to God; as a social being he sustains relations to his fellow-man.

"We are told that no two ultimate particles of matter can touch each other. In like manner every human being has an individuality which cannot be surrendered, a personality which cannot be lost in society as a drop of water is lost in the sea. There are experiences through which every soul must pass as wholly alone as if no other human being existed. As the poet Keble wrote:

'Not even the tenderest heart, and next our own,
Knows half the reasons why we smile or sigh.
Each in his hidden sphere of joy and woe,
Our hermit spirits dwell, and range apart.' †

* Strong, "The New Era." Chap. VI., pp. 114, 115.

† Keble, "Christian Year." 24th Trinity.

"Moral character is something individual and involves personal accountability. No man can live out of relations to God; and the character of these relations indicates the character of the man.

"But if two ultimate particles of matter cannot touch each other, neither can they exist out of relations with each other. It is equally true that men cannot live out of relation with their fellow-men; and the character of these relations determines the character of society. Humanity being what it is, every man must 'bear his own burden,' and we must also 'bear one another's burden.' . . . These facts being fundamental; it has been no accident that the progress of civilization from the beginning has been along the two lines already pointed out, viz., the development of the individual and the organization of society. And the world's progress in the future must necessarily be along these same lines."

The perfection of the individual accordingly requires a social state in which room is made for growth in these two directions. God is the sun of our human life; and as the tree grows under the influence of solar energy without which not a single atom of carbon can become a part of its organic structure, so man as an individual forms personal traits and characteristics through the operation of forces which radiate from Heaven. But as the tree needs soil, air and moisture, so does man need an environment not of rocks, woods and hills, but of "men, high-minded men," in order that the warp and woof of life may be woven into a fabric of the finest texture in the loom of time.

Man has been called a "fighting animal," a "political animal," and a "religious animal." There is a measure of truth in each of these designations; but each is faulty if it is intended to set forth a fundamental characteristic from which the complex resultant of human history may be derived. Hobbes may ingeniously "derive" society from a truce and an agreement to divide between two belligerents; Herbert Spencer may conjecture that the belief in supernatural beings arose from the dreams of primitive men when they seemed in their sleep to associate and converse with their ancestors or companions who had departed from this earthly

life. But an agreement between two or more men does not constitute government, nor does the belief in ghosts constitute religion. Society means organization under a governing power ✓ on the basis of right and justice, and religion means the belief in a Supreme Being or divinity with the consequent obligation of worship and service. Both of these rest, no doubt, upon natural capacity; but they imply also a stage of development beyond that of the animal, a relation between man and man, and between man and the Deity (in whatsoever form the latter may be conceived of) that makes room for the interaction of all those subtle forces upon which human progress depends. In other words the full conception of humanity involves that of society, and society necessarily requires for its development and progress both the state and religion.

"The state is that organization of our human life, wider than the family, which involves the consociation of man with man in close fellowship under the control of a governing power by which true human development is made possible and secure." It is more than an instrument for the enforcement of right. It is the enlarged man, the composite man, in which the individual attains to his full and free development, affording a fulness and freedom to the individual in the exact proportion in which the state itself has reached a high degree of culture and civilization. It may be true that a small state often contains great men among its citizens, and *vice versa*; but the greatness of a citizen is not independent of the state of which he is an integral part, and mean citizens have never yet constituted a great state.

"What constitutes a state?

Not high-raised battlement or labored mound,
Thick wall or moated gate;

Not cities proud with spires and turrets crowned;
Not bays and broad-armed ports,

Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride;
Not starred and spangled courts,

Where low-browed baseness wafts perfume to pride.

No:—men, high-minded men,

With powers as far above dull brutes endued

In forest, brake or fen,
 As beasts exel cold rocks and brambles rude,
 Men who their duties know,
 But know their rights, and, knowing, dare maintain,
 Prevent the long-aimed blow,
 And crush the tyrant while they rend the chain;
 These constitute a state;
 And sovereign law, that state's collected will,
 O'er thrones and globes elate
 Sits empress, crowning good, repressing ill."

The state, as the outward expression of organized society and the sphere of social cointegration, that is to say the sphere in which both the individual and society, by their interaction, are mutually helping each other to advance towards their perfection, is not the broadest possible conception of humanity. It is, however, the highest form of concrete development that has as yet been reached. Ideally there is one humanity which lies at the root of all human development, but it has not reached outward expression in an organized form. There is room for a tendency towards universal humanization. We find the expression of such universality in art, science, and general culture, and the consciousness of it enters into the process of development in church and state. "*Homo sum ; humani nihil a me alienum puto.*" But this conception is the goal of human development, rather than an actualization of the present time, and, certainly no existing church or state would rationally arrogate to itself such claims of universality. The state, then, is only a partial organization of humanity looking towards a larger end. But, such as it is, it is the condition without which there can be no material, intellectual or moral progress.

It is the office of the state, then, to afford room and opportunity for human progress. Such progress includes the attainment by every generation of a larger measure of physical comfort and a higher degree of intellectual and moral culture. The one word which sums up and expresses the trend of the whole movement, the goal of human history, is the word freedom, signifying first physical freedom or the escape from hunger

and thirst, cold, pestilence, and limitation by natural barriers and the obstacles which nature everywhere presents to enlarged and unhampered human existence; secondly, intellectual freedom or the surmounting of ignorance and error and the realization of an enlarged spiritual life in the apprehension of truth and the enjoyment of beauty; thirdly, ethical freedom, or the attainment of man's royal dignity in the surmounting of every restraint on the part of his lower nature, so that he stands free to act, free to create, and free to communicate in the bosom of society in full harmony with the inner law of his being. It is very true that this aspect of social development is not the one usually emphasized when the office of the state is set forth. Stress is usually laid on stability, strength and grandeur, or on the conditions by which the highest degree of comfort and the largest measure of prosperity are secured. Mr. Thomas B. Reed, speaking in Philadelphia some time ago, said: "It may seem strange to this audience for a man who has spent so little of his time in the accumulation of wealth as the one who now addresses you, to say that the most important thing which a community can do is to accumulate wealth. Perhaps I ought to go further and say that the accumulation of wealth is of more importance than all the other things put together which a community can do." And then after contrasting the condition of America with that of other lands he proceeds to define wealth as follows: "You may be thinking of gold and silver, bonds and notes of hand, stocks and title deeds, and the things that are put into safety-deposit vaults and are the belongings of men who are the subjects of our just human envy. That is not quite what is meant. By wealth I am going to mean this evening—whether it be a scientific definition or not—everything which human beings have made and can make to satisfy human desires—whether they harness the rivers to do the work or turn coal energy into steam, or use the subtle forces of electricity, or the fertility of the field, or the products of the great ocean."*

It may be admitted that wealth is one of the concomitants

* Address before Peirce's Business College.

of civilization, and, to some extent, an index and a measure of national prosperity, particularly if, as Mr. Reed is careful to say, it is accumulated not by a few individuals, but by the community. And yet the possession or the acquisition of wealth is certainly not the chief end to be aimed at in the life of an individual or of a nation. Who would say that the simple but valiant Swiss were inferior, as men or as a nationality, to their proud and wealthy neighbors, the haughty Austrians or the luxurious Burgundians? Were they not right in refusing to sell "the genuine pearl of manly worth for empty pomp and gaudy show?" According to Mr. Reed they should have accumulated wealth instead of fighting for liberty. Wealth may indeed be striven for; but the moment it is made the exclusive or even the chief incentive to human exertion, it becomes a snare and tends to degrade. On the other hand, if sought as a means, as it is the result of frugal industry directed by intelligence and skill under the protection of a wise and stable government, so it becomes in turn an incentive to exertion and a powerful instrument for the promotion of national progress.

The significance of national life, then, is not all on the surface. There is an inner side of human development, not only of equal importance, but of even greater importance, because it forms the indispensable condition of national greatness and prosperity. Industrial progress has been called the mother of civilization, and commerce the harbinger of law and freedom, and there is force and truth in the statement. But industrial progress and commerce are not the cause of civilization; they are themselves the effect of forces working in the bosom of society, and are only the means by which the result of their working is made manifest with accelerated speed as the outward conditions prepare the way for such manifestation.

It is not an accident, therefore, that, in the founding of states and the crystallization of nationalities, government and religion should appear together, and the organization of society should be bound up with forms of religious belief and worship.

✓ It is not too much to say that every ancient state had a religious basis. Egypt and the monarchies of the East, Greece and Rome, were as thoroughly pervaded by the religious idea without a divine revelation as the Jews were with it, and in every case the best results of their national development, the highest achievements in art and science, to which they attained, the most sacred interests of their individual and social life, were animated and governed by the glow of their religious faith. As long as their faith continued to influence and control their conduct, they were virtuous, in the ancient sense of the word, and grew in strength and greatness; but when they suffered shipwreck in their faith, they became corrupt, and fell never to rise again. I am quite well aware that it has been the fashion to ridicule the religious systems of the ancients and to make sport of their superstition. Their belief in gods and goddesses, their tendency to personify the forces of nature and deify their heroes, are characterized as childish, and their advance in culture and civilization is said to have delivered them from such thralldom. Or, if their religious ideas persisted and were developed into religious systems, this fact is accounted for on the supposition that designing men, assuming the role of priests, elaborated systems of belief and worship for the purpose of strengthening their own power and influence. Priestcraft is thus made synonymous with imposition and tyranny. It may be freely admitted that some of the greatest crimes recorded upon the pages of history were perpetrated in the name of religion, and that the history of religion itself is full of ignorance, superstition, corruption and tyranny. But these outward features occur in the decadence, and not in the rise of religious systems. They result from the abuse, not the use, of religion. Hypocrisy is always hateful and debasing, and of all hypocrites the religious hypocrite is the worst. To the hostile critic of religion and priests it is sufficient to say that he does not state the facts correctly. Priests did not make religion, but religion made priests. In the early ages of human history there was no separate priestly class. At first the father of the family pos-

sessed also the function of priest and offered the sacrifices of the household; but each individual could and did bring his own offerings to the Deity as the events of his daily life seemed to require. Later the chief of a tribe, the leader of a host, or the king, who was the father of his people on a larger scale, was both ruler and priest. This is the condition of things described in the Old Testament, even with a developed priesthood, down to the time of Saul and David. The same is true of Greece at the time of the Trojan war. This accounts for the fact that the deities worshiped were supposed to preside over a limited area or jurisdiction, or to be specially concerned with or for particular nationalities. Priests came by a process of differentiation of function, a sort of division of labor; they were attached to particular altars and temples, rather than to particular religious systems, until by the advance of art and science they became the bearers of knowledge, and rose to great power and influence. But even in those cases where there were priests by profession, kings and rulers still continued at times to exercise their priestly function, and there was the closest union between the government and the administrators of religion. Roman consuls, yea, even emperors, in connection with their civil office, frequently held the position of *pontifex maximus*, thus illustrating the close relation between civil and religious development, a relation which, as we have seen, existed in the beginning, and which has not ceased to exist even in our own time.

Why should there be this close relation between the state and religion in the whole process of human developments? There seems to be but one answer to the question: Religion is an integral part of man's social nature, and absolutely necessary to the healthy growth of the state. This truth is beginning to force itself upon the attention of scientific men as never before. Even those evolutionists who have hitherto taken little interest in religion except as a stage of intellectual and moral development that must be outgrown and left behind as we get a clearer insight into the processes by which human progress comes to pass, are beginning to find that the religious factor in man is

not so readily set aside. It is admitted on all sides that human culture requires society—society constituted on a principle altogether different from the selfish propensities of the animal. In other words selfishness must be replaced by altruism. But how are we to account for altruism? It will not suffice to say that it is the result of development, for, as Mr. Huxley says, "the immoral sentiments have been no less evolved. There is, so far, as much natural sanction for the one as for the other. The thief and the murderer follow nature just as much as the philanthropist." * "Social progress means a checking of the ✓ cosmic process at every step and the substitution for it of another, which may be called the ethical process; the end of which is not the survival of those who may happen to be the fittest in respect of the whole of the conditions which obtain, ✓ but of those who are ethically the best." † There is no satisfactory way of meeting the difficulty except that of assuming that altruism, as the ethical principle, is the product of religion, and is developed and strengthened in proportion to the genuineness of religion itself in any given case. In the language of ✓ Mr. Kidd: "In the religious beliefs of mankind we have not simply a class of phenomena peculiar to the childhood of the race. We have therein the characteristic feature of our social evolution. These beliefs constitute, in short, the natural and inevitable complement of our reason; and so far from being threatened with eventual dissolution they are apparently destined to continue to grow with the growth and to develop with the development of society, while always preserving intact and unchangeable the one essential feature they all have in common in the ultra-rational sanction they provide for conduct. And lastly, as we understand how an ultra-rational sanction for the sacrifice of the interests of the individual to those of the organism has been a feature common to all religions, we see, ✓ also, why the conception of sacrifice has occupied such a central place in nearly all beliefs, and why the tendency of religion has ever been to surround this principle with the most impressive

* *Evolution and Ethics*, pp. 79, 80.

† *Opus. Cit.*, p. 81.

and stupendous sanctions."* All religious systems in this way enforce ethical principles and make room for social development; but they differ widely in the purity of their moral precepts, and the moral conditions to which they give rise. Christianity, as a matter of course, is pre-eminent in both respects, and as it inculcates the purest morality, so also does it foster the healthiest national life. Prof. Bowne says: "In truth, the significance of Christianity lies far less in the field of formal moral judgments than in that of the extra-ethical conceptions which condition their application, and even more in that of moral and spiritual inspiration. In this last respect it is as steam compared with ice, which, however identical chemically, are dynamically very different."† It is the office of religion, therefore, to develop and foster the spirit of altruism and to establish the fundamental principles of right conduct in society over against the selfishness everywhere manifest in the struggle for existence.

But, besides this, religion has another office. Human progress requires not only the organization of society on the basis of good-will and helpfulness between its members by virtue of which the wants of all are met in their mutual complementation, but also an upward movement in culture and refinement, the development of art and science. Here again the selfish principle is sordid, and looks to the prose common-place of life; religion, on the other hand, is the inspiring power of civilization, the foster-mother of the arts, the beneficent genius of science. I know that just the reverse has been asserted, and it is not difficult to point to examples of ignorance, intolerance, and opposition to all culture on the part of so-called religious men. But such opposition in every case has come from a perversion of religion, or an imperfect, narrow apprehension of its real life and spirit. The historical argument, we think, is all-sufficient to prove the point. Have not architecture, painting, sculpture, poetry and music all been developed through the inspiration and under the fostering hand of the religious

* *Social Evolution*, p. 116.† *Principles of Ethics*, p. 201.

impulse? And is it not true even now, that while states may vote appropriations for the encouragement of learning and art, they cannot furnish the inspiration for high achievement? These things come by inspiration from the emotional side of our nature, the springs of which it is the province of religion to touch, and by the challenge of a lofty ideal which religion alone can furnish. Realism in art is the blight of art, and the tendency to emphasize the common-place, the vicious, or the ignoble, so widely prevalent in art and literature at the present day, is a movement away from the normal development of these interests. In other words, religion is the motive and
✓ inspiring genius of culture and civilization, because its spirit is that of true virtue or manliness, the real basis of national strength and greatness.

✓ Finally religion is necessary to the state in order to the full development of the spirit of liberty and the attainment of true freedom. This is especially true of that form of religion which we call Christianity, the very essence of which is the genius of freedom. It teaches the equality of all men because it emphasizes the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.
✓ Accordingly wherever the genuine spirit of Christianity has planted its foot, there the flowers of freedom have sprung up. It has raised the fallen, freed the captive, relieved the oppressed, set free the slave, and exalted woman to her true place in society. It has worked its way into national and international law. It has abolished barbarous modes of punishment, and infused the spirit of humanity and charity into all our institutions. It has by its silent working in this way lighted the torch of freedom and illuminated the world. But it has done more than this. It has by its direct influence upon the organization of governments, by the spirit which radiated from Switzerland and Holland, given an impulse to representative government which has wrought the most beneficent results in the founding of our own nation, and has touched with its quickening power the nations of Europe and the islands of the sea.

Recognizing the importance of religion to the state, as it is apparent from the intimate connection and co-ordinate development of the two from the beginning, it is necessary to inquire into the normal relation between the two. Should church and state be united, or should they be wholly independent? And if united, should the state exercise control over the church or the church over the state? If not united, can they or should they exercise any influence one over the other, or should each be left to work out its own problem without help or hindrance from the other? Sociology has no weightier problems to deal with than those involved in these questions.

In the light of history two things are clearly apparent: First, from the earliest times there has existed union between the state and religion, sometimes the one exercising a controlling influence, sometimes the other. Secondly, the trend of the historical movement is evidently away from such union toward a condition of relative or absolute independence. It has been shown that even in heathen countries the state made provision for the maintenance and practice of religious worship. Under the Jewish dispensation the government was a theocracy. In either case close union was maintained until the advent of Christianity. In general, we may say, the secular power was the stronger and the state ruled the church. Still its rule was not without the church, and when in the first centuries of the Christian era the attempt was made to eradicate the new religion with fire and sword, at any cost, whatever hostility to the new religion the state may have felt, the measures taken to suppress it were put forth avowedly in the interest of religion. Subsequently, when Christianity conquered, it became the state religion, and it grew in influence and authority until its power overshadowed the state. The long and fearful contests which followed between church and state need not be recited here. It is well known that the church gained the day and that all the world lay in submission at the feet of the Roman pontiff, who exercised the power of the church over the nations avowedly, this time, in the interest of law and order and the public good.

Far be it from us to say that the development of authority in this form was not beneficial and salutary ; but it was not beneficial to the church nor salutary to society in its ulterior consequences, and when the pendulum had swung to its limit on the one side it returned to the other. So the power of the church, its external, secular power, moved, and it will never return in the same form again. With the advent of protestant Christianity the spirit of freedom asserted itself, and everywhere men and institutions, churches and states struggled against restraint of all kinds. As the spirit of authority brought with it certain benefits, so the spirit of freedom brought in its train a host of evils. And yet who would not readily admit that human progress received a new impulse, and freedom a surer habitation among men, in the new era which dawned upon Western Europe because of the light which shone from Wittenberg and Zurich and Geneva? The movement towards an entire separation between church and state, involving the abolition of state churches and entire disestablishment, is gaining in volume, and it will not be long before men everywhere will be in a position to "render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

The absolute independence of church and state, so far as organization and government are concerned, although at first sight not in harmony with the spirit of the past, is the legitimate outgrowth of modern history, the result of the process of development to which the two institutions have been subject through the ages, and a necessary condition in order that both may receive, in the present age, the best help from each other in the solution of their respective problems.

The union of church and state is an injury to the state. If the influence of the church should prove the stronger, the state would be hampered in its development. Religion is necessary to the state as a moulding and animating power, but cannot, in the nature of the case, control its external life and shape its policy without stifling it in its utterance and dwarfing its growth—a growth just as legitimate and natural on its

own basis as that of any other department of human life. If, on the other hand, the state, as the governing power, attempts to provide for and control the church, it attempts to do that for which it is not properly qualified and must suffer serious loss in consequence. Even if we could conceive of ability and skill on the part of the government to select the proper men and choose the proper policy for the administration of religious affairs, inequality and injustice would necessarily accompany all its efforts, as is the case now in all countries which have an established church. The state cannot stifle the voice of conscience; the state may not attempt to cast its citizens' religious life in one mould; the state may not even force religion or the support of religion upon any one without wronging both the individual and the church. The state is stronger precisely in proportion as it keeps itself free from entangling alliances, and secures the cordial support of its citizens for morality and religion on the basis of their own preferences and convictions.

The union of church and state is an injury to the church. The great law of all progress throughout the universe is that of the survival of the fittest in the struggle for existence. We do not mean by fittest, the strongest or the richest, but the one best fitted for the sphere in which its life is to develop. In the moral sphere this requires that the individual should be ethically best fitted for good conduct; in the religious sphere, that his religion should be the purest. Religion that will not bear the test suggested in Lessing's fable of the three rings, that it should work reflexively and manifest its genuineness by the influence which it exerts upon its possessor, is of little account. As the world is constituted, taking human nature as it is, the spur of competition is necessary to the accomplishment of the best results in church and state, in business and politics, in art and science. To take away this incentive from the church, to remove from her the necessity of exertion, to free her from criticism and censure or the possibility of suffering loss, is to limit her possibilities, hamper her growth, and dim the brightness of the light which shines from within. Has the church

not prospered in the midst of fiery persecution, and has she not become vain, corrupt and tyrannical when she was favored of men and exalted in power? Give her the preëminence and she is in danger of becoming haughty and corrupt; make her dependent, and she loses her vigor and the ability to sustain a healthy, robust life; provide for her, and like any other parasite she will lose the ability to provide for herself. How often has history proved the correctness of these statements! She has professed her faith in the teeth of her persecutors and suffered martyrdom for conscience sake. But while claiming freedom of conscience for herself, she has denied it to the others. She has put heretics to death, burned witches, persecuted Quakers and refused toleration to Baptists. In fact, she has been slow to learn the lesson of religious freedom which was emphasized and enforced for her sometimes by those upon whom religious obligations sat but lightly, so that it could often be said to her children: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of!" But, thank God, she has surmounted all that, and, left to her own resources, with fair treatment, impartial justice and adequate protection by the state, she will not only maintain her growth, but she will also in the fullest measure fulfill her mission in her ministration to the state.

The absolute independence of church and state does not mean, however, the want of interest or influence from the one towards the other. It does not matter much whether the name of God be inserted in the constitution of our country; but it does matter a great deal whether the fundamental principles of Christianity be recognized in our legislation and the administration of justice. It is not so very important that our public officials should be members of the church, but it is exceedingly important that members of the church should be concerned for the election of good men to positions of public trust, and that Christian sentiment should make itself felt in exacting strict accountability from those who hold public office, and in insisting that the laws of the land should be enforced without fear or favor. In this respect the church has been at fault. "In one

respect," Prof. Bowne says, "Christian teaching has often wrought moral damage. Its various ascetic manifestations may illustrate. . . . The ever-present irony of death, which so surely blights all earthly prospects and blasts all earthly hopes, readily lends itself to misinterpretation," . . . so that there is often found "in religious circles an indifference to social and political duties. The world lies in wickedness ; politics are mire and filth. There is no hope or help in anything but a supernatural irruption from above. Reflections of this sort have often turned religious persons into bad citizens and indifferent neighbors. And this must be the case with any view which, from whatever source it may draw its inspirations, does not find the chief forms of concrete duty within the visible life."* Christianity is said to inculcate the spirit of "other worldliness." This is precisely what the vicious and corrupt men who prey upon the life of the state desire. They approve of Christianity and support the church, as long as the church "minds its own business" and does not meddle with their trade. They will even go to church and pat the minister on the back when he denounces vice and corruption in general terms. But if the voice of the church is heard on great public questions, or if definite abuses and cases of vile corruption are touched, then Christians are reminded that the church degrades herself by going into politics, and ministers ought to confine themselves to the preaching of the gospel. There is danger of error and abuse in the discharge of the church's difficult mission in this respect. But, undoubtedly, Christian principle and Christian effort are primarily intended for this life, and here that influence must be exerted if the state is to prosper.

The church and the state represent two lines of human development. As they respectively progress, exerting a mutually beneficent influence, they undoubtedly approach each other. Will they ever meet? And if so, what form of organization will human life then take? Practically, no ; at least so far as ✓ this world is concerned. But, ideally, undoubtedly yes. The

* *Ethics (Principles of)*, p. 193.

process of humanization, which is a part of all genuine culture, requires the actualization of the great ideal of perfect humanity in the future life. Church and state will merge in one. Some will have it that the church will in its perfection include all the functions of the state. Rothe, on the other hand, maintains that the state will become all-comprehensive and embody the universal life of mankind. It is a striking fact that in St. John's vision of the New Jerusalem he saw no temple. Rev. 21: 22-27. "And I saw no temple therein; for the Lord God, the Almighty and the Lamb are the temple thereof. And the city hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine upon it; for the glory of God did lighten it, and the lamp thereof is the Lamb. And the nations shall walk amidst the light thereof; and the kings of the earth do bring their glory into it." This description, so vivid and complete, shows how secular and spiritual things here become wholly blended when all the streams of development have poured their contents into the ocean of a perfect life of love.

III.

THE RE-STATEMENT OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

BY THE REV. A. S. WEBER, A.M.

THERE lie before me a number of books, all of them published within recent years, whose contents disclose an interesting and significant movement in theology. Differing widely as to their titles,* these volumes pursue their various courses of thought independently not only of one another, but also of parties and schools. The movement of which these books are a partial exponent thus far has not been organized. The strength and speed of its current, it is evident, have not exercised the same influence upon the several contributing minds. Some appear to be struggling more or less successfully against it; others are impelled onward by its power, but retain full control of themselves and their course; whilst others still are swept along to what many regard unwarranted lengths, and without the power of resisting conclusions even to themselves surprising and unwelcome. The movement ought not to be judged, however, by what extremists have to say, but by what is sound and safe and moderate in it. In most of these books the careful reader will find insufficiencies or excesses, but the sincerity and reverence of their effort may well commend them to the student's earnest consideration.

The authors of these books seem to have this one purpose in common, namely, to effect a re-statement of certain doctrines

* Allen's *Religious Progress*; Bascom's *The New Theology*; Bradford's *Spirit and Life*; Bruce's *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*; Fairbairn's *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*; Ladd's *What is the Bible?* Lindsay's *Progressiveness of Modern Christian Thought*; Munger's *The Freedom of Faith*; Sanday's *Inspiration*, *The Bampton Lectures for 1893*.

of the Christian faith, in order to make those doctrines in their re-stated form more nearly answerable to the demands of the religious consciousness of our times, than they are as formulated in the theologies inherited from, or slavishly patterned after, those of earlier ages. The necessity for such re-statements from time to time lies in the very nature of theology as a progressive science. So long as there can be growth in knowledge, absolute sufficiency and finality can be ascribed to no department of human thought. However adequate and satisfying the doctrinal statements of reformation times, for instance, or of preceding theological periods, may have been, one needs not to be widely acquainted with current thought in the periodical literature of our day, to become assured that they continue to be so no longer. The necessity of giving recognition in some way to existent dissatisfaction with not a few of the Church's ancient formulas of doctrine, is being forced upon denomination after denomination in the Protestant world, and signs are not wanting that even in the communion which professes to be unchanging this is likewise the case.

One of the Churches, in which, as regards such needed change, wiser counsels seem to prevail than in some of the rest, has recognized the reasonableness of such demand, and answered it, in part at least, by effecting a so-called "enrichment" of its book of doctrine and worship. Another of the Churches, having strong conservative and progressive elements arrayed against each other in apparently unyielding controversy, has been deeply agitated over the proposed revision of its confession inherited from the Westminster divines. A third of the Churches, whose heroic devotion to and efficient prosecution of the work of missions has for a century been admired and praised throughout Christendom, has during the last decade been greatly hampered in that work because of opposition shown to revised Christian doctrine as taught in one of its leading theological institutions. One other of the Churches, which has good cause for glorying in its irenic and catholic confessional standard, formulated by Heidelberg theologians of the sixteenth century,

has not within the last few years been without reminders, from lay and clerical sources, of demands sooner or later to be made for new statements of doctrine as taught by the Reformed Church. These latter demands have reference to the comparatively few points wherein the Catechism exceeds the true intent or idea of a confession, and undertakes to define doctrines in theology; they may refer perhaps more particularly to similar definitions, expressed or implied in the offices of Ordination, Baptism and Communion, as contained in other books permitted or prescribed for use in the churches. No such definitions or statements of doctrine can be imposed by one age, with the expectation of making them permanently binding upon succeeding ones. The experiment has had repeated trials, and the result has invariably been the same.

Now, it is in response to widespread dissatisfaction of this character, to be seen more or less in all the Churches, and in the exercise of privileges which in Protestantism ought to be unquestioned, that the books now under reference have been written. Not only were the authors of them impressed by the fact of such dissatisfaction existing in the minds of others, they themselves have evidently had similar experience and have labored with zeal for bringing relief to their own disturbed minds. For themselves, it is manifest, their efforts have been not unsuccessful. Their mental perplexities as regards some of the doctrines in traditional form have been relieved, annoying doubts concerning others have been removed simply by presenting to themselves the same truths in new attire, or formulated according to a new and different governing principle. In a re-stated form these Christian doctrines have accomplished for our authors' minds results well calculated to inspire the confidence with which they are now offered by them for the helpfulness of their contemporaries, a confidence which has not escaped their adverse critics, but to which is due, nevertheless, the marked interest, it is claimed, which their volumes have commanded from the day of their publication, and maintained with increasing power as the circle of their readers has come to be enlarged.

Before turning to give consideration to several of the particular doctrines re-stated in these books, one additional preliminary observation may be indulged: Whilst generally spoken of as new, the type of theology set forth by these writers in their re-statements of the truth, it is warmly protested by more than one of them, is not new. In the volume which among them is of earliest publication it is declared, for instance, that "these so-called new conceptions of Christian doctrine that are now floating in the minds of men with promise of crystallizing into form, are not of recent origin. They prevailed in the first centuries of the Church while the stream ran clear from the near fountain, and they have re-appeared all along in individual minds and schools as the highest peaks of a mountain range catch the sunshine whilst the base is enveloped in mist and shadow, not many and often far separate, but enough to show the trend and to bear witness to the light."* The readers of these books who are acquainted with the history of Christian doctrine will find in them what will be regarded as sufficient warrant for the author of the latest of the volumes to speak of the theological type of the movement as "that which is not only not new, but that which is older, and if one cared to say so, more respectable in its antecedents than that by which it is supplanted in the current theology of Western Christendom. The flood of light which has been thrown upon the age immediately succeeding that of the Apostles has discovered to us an older theology than that of Augustine, more refined and mature in the expression of its thought, and, as it seems to us, more true to the idea of Christianity as presented in the New Testament."†

Since the appearance of Schleiermacher among the theologians of Germany, and of that "true sovereign of English thought," as Hare calls Coleridge, among those of Britain, the number of men willing to ally themselves with the older Greek theology rather than with the later Latin conceptions has been

* Munger's *The Freedom of Faith*, pp. 3, 4.

† Allen's *The Theological Renaissance of the Nineteenth Century*, p. 2.

gradually increasing. This preference on their part must not be interpreted, however, to mean that the Alexandrine form of doctrine is an expression of the truth adequate to modern requirements. The language quoted from two of our authors means only that the earlier form of thought is closer to that required in our day than the later. Greek theology is not the creature of supernatural wisdom, or the result of special divine enlightenment, any more than those of Westminster or Heidelberg. All of them are marked by the intellectual and moral limitations of the men and times that produced them, and insufficient, therefore, as final statements of doctrine, which must be always binding. The religious intuitions underlying all these theologies may be valid for all time; but the doctrinal formulations, which are the result of reflection in the light of the Gospel upon these intuitions, do not commend themselves as similarly valid.* If this distinction between religious intuitions and doctrinal formulations were more clearly perceived, could opposition to the making of change in the form of doctrine be so common, or would resistance to it be so bitter?

Those who insist that the type of theology represented by this movement is a return to earlier Greek conceptions do not mean by that, therefore, that which is essentially different from the view of those who regard that type as new. All of them recognize the fact of doctrinal development, and acknowledge that the progress of time has brought increased light. These necessitate not a rejection of the intuitive basis of truth underlying the old statements, but a new statement of the same truth, with emphasis changed and sight adjusted to suit the altered intellectual and moral environment of the new times. Upon this point one of our volumes speaks with a con-

*Since writing the above, I have read the able editorial contribution on "*The Reformed Church and Her Creed*," in the last number of this REVIEW. The writer says: "Doctrines are the result of logical reflection upon the truths or facts of faith in connection with the scientific study of the Bible. This result will always be conditioned by the intellectual and moral culture of an age. Doctrines therefore cannot be settled once for all. No system of theology can be valid for all time."

viction that makes its language eloquent. "Theology is but the reflex of Christian thought and experience, and must not only welcome the modifying impact of the sciences, but, as the science of sciences, must itself lead the van of intellectual progress. The very function of faith in our Protestant theology implies the repudiation of blinding traditionalism and the recognition of ceaseless progress, a growing capacity of union between subject and object, between our spiritual consciousness and the being of God, between faith itself and objective Christianity. Faith carries with it imperious obligation to derive its theology directly and independently from the divinely ordained sources. 'Truth,' says Milton, 'is compared in Scripture to a running fountain; if her waters flow not in perpetual progression they sicken into a muddy pool of conformity and tradition.' With new social, as with new intellectual problems, the theology of modern days has been called to deal; in dealing with them it has proved itself as well the sanctifying light of the former, as the stimulating light of the latter." *

With these general and imperfect references to the purpose, trend and character of these volumes, and the brief notice of the progressive principle which underlies them all, we must now content ourselves. Before calling into examination specific doctrines, it should be said that what follows is of course not intended as anything like an exhaustive review of the richness of the volumes. That richness must be gathered from the wide field covered by the books themselves, a field embracing not simply the few topics here noticed, but most of the doctrines belonging to the entire realm of Christian truth. The end here aimed at is the modest one of calling attention simply to a few doctrines in whose features the more prominent characteristics of the new theological movement may be seen, and thus an intelligent estimate placed upon its value.

1. The first of these is the Christian doctrine of the Holy Scriptures. To the discussion of this question several of our authors bring their ripest and best powers, and devote more of

* Lindsay's *Progressiveness of Modern Christian Thought*, pp. 26-28.

their pages than to any other single topic. As implied in their titles, two of our volumes are wholly occupied with different phases of the scriptural problem, and a number of others have longer or shorter sections given to the consideration of one or another aspect of the same question.

In Fairbairn's volume, notable at once for its richness of learning and penetrative philosophical grasp, we find a lucid discussion of inspiration and revelation in their bearing upon the authority of the Bible. The idea of a written revelation, he believes to be involved in the very conception of a living God. Speech is natural to spirit, and God being spirit, it will be natural for Him to reveal Himself in speech to men, and through men. Those who hear Him best will be most possessed of God, which possession is termed "inspiration." God inspires, man reveals; inspiration is the process by which God gives; revelation is the mode or form, word, character or institution, in which man embodies what he has received. The embodiment of such gifts of inspiration in literature involves a form of authority, an authority which belongs to the Bible not as a book marked by human imperfections, but as a revelation perfect for the divine purpose of making known God's will and man's destiny. And in order that this authority may be realized, the inspiration of the men who read is as intrinsic and integral an element as the inspiration of the men who wrote.

To the important thought here expressed we shall return in the course of our examination of Bascom's chapter on inspiration, in which there is developed a more radical departure from traditional conceptions. He records his views with the vigor and skill of a literary master in the initial chapter of his volume. Those views may not command the endorsement of our minds; but the reverent frankness with which they are expressed, and the certainty with which they impress us as to the author's meaning—characteristics not always found in those who have written on this subject—cannot but win for this writer admiration and regard.

According to Bascom's notion, "inspiration properly means

a breath of life—a living transfer of the divine thought to us, a free participation on our part in it.” Its essential functions are performed in its relations to, and the formation of, personalities. It is something that is predicable of living men, rather than of the written or printed pages of a book.* The minds of those whose writings are preserved in the Bible, no doubt, were enveloped in the thought of God, and as thoroughly as circumstances permitted, possessed by the truth. But this does not involve the necessity of inerrancy in either the thought or expression of their records, and does not lift the Scriptures into a region whence their truths speak with an authority that is higher or power that is greater than that of truths from other books or writings of whatsoever kind.† God’s greatest gifts are not given to us in written words, but in ourselves, and in the living Christ who is the way, the truth, the life—the life which is the light of men, the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. With Him we abide livingly and lovingly among divine things. What God, as revealed by Him, is to one He is to all, and in a profound sense equally to

*With this the language of the Pastoral Letter on the *Incarnation and Inspiration*, recently issued by Episcopalian Bishops, seems to agree: “It is men who are inspired and not primarily the book; it was to men our Lord gave the promise and assurance of inspiration.”

† Stress is here laid, it will be observed, upon the *truths* of the Bible, as compared with the *truths* of other books. The argument means, I take it, that truth is truth, carrying as such the same authority, no matter through what medium, He who is the Truth, may convey it to human minds. This does not place the Bible and other books on the same level. Being the only record of God’s redemptive love, the only record of the Father’s drawing near to his children in Jesus Christ, the only record declarative of the Father’s good will, to the extent even of the disobedient children’s salvation, Scripture is unique and entitled to the loftiest place in literature. Bascom’s contention is not against this position. He insists only that its truths shall not be supposed to rest for their authority upon a false conception of the function of inspiration. For the Reformers, we know, it was the “*testimonium Spiritus sancti internum*” that in connection with the truths of the Bible constituted their independence and power. May it not be that for ourselves likewise, greater power may result from insisting upon the witness of the Spirit of truth in our hearts, in connection with the truths of the Bible, rather than from reliance upon an authority outwardly imposed upon the letter of Scripture?

all. Man's inspiration is the inspiration which God has poured out from the beginning, like sunshine and rain for the fertilization of all fields. The writers of the Scriptures were the recipients of this inspiration, but like the servants of truth everywhere, they were left under it to make what shift they could in reaching conclusions and doing their work. No exception to God's universal method is discoverable as having been made in their behalf. The touch of that inspiration is to-day enjoyed as it was when the different books of the Bible were written. The very action of our powers manifests the Divine aid. Everything else is secondary to this. The kingdom of God is within us; Christ in us is our hope of illumination here no less than of glory hereafter.

Reasoning like this is the ground upon which he bases his warrant for denying the formal inspiration as taught by traditional theories, and insisting upon and emphasizing a real inspiration. "We brush aside an external and inefficient gift," he says, "only that we may accept an all-sufficient one in the mind itself." He believes that God does most for us, when we do most for ourselves, and no longer make any division between the divine and human in truth. It is all divine, all human—the atmosphere in which the Spirit of God and the spirit of man meet each other. Men, therefore, who are strong and enlightened by the power and presence of the divine Spirit, should, he thinks, get over the lazy love of an external authority and finality which weak natures, as an inheritance from Papal ages and traditions, continue to retain. "He who places his hand in the hand of God to be led of Him, must be up by times, take many weary steps, and find himself in many obscure places. Yet thus there is safety, and thus there is strength. We are ready to strive for this liberty of walking with God."

These views, obscured no doubt by being condensed into the brief space of the above paragraphs, are not allowed to stand without bringing them support from the Bible. The very passages that would likely occur to an opponent as bearing testimony against them, are called up, re-examined, and shown

readily to receive a less rigid interpretation than that generally put upon them by commentators of the old school. "All Scripture is given by the inspiration of God ; " " Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost "—these passages say nothing, in his judgment, to negative the statements he has made. For the positive confirmation of his views, he calls attention to the introductory words of the third Gospel, where Luke puts forth no claim for authority except that of personal knowledge. He mentions the variations between the reported sayings of Christ, in the Sermon on the Mount, as given by Matthew and Luke—variations that are inexplicable upon the theory of both writers alike being saved by divine intervention from material error. He quotes, moreover, the Lord's promise : "And I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth. . . . He shall lead you into all truth,"—a promise not simply to the first disciples, but an assurance of inspiration for the comfort, the support, the guidance of all Christians. "We all drink the cup of Christ, and we are all baptized with His baptism."

Whatever differences there may be discoverable between the doctrinal statements of Bascom and Ladd, at various places in their arguments, the doctrine of Scripture as drawn from the passage just quoted by the former, is in entire harmony with what the latter has to say upon the same point : "We proclaim ourselves among those," he writes, "who believe in the perpetual inspiration of the Church of God. And, indeed, without believing heartily in this, no one can intelligently believe in Holy Scripture."* And this is not the only point where the opinion of these scholars is found to be in close agreement. Their views are substantially the same upon the question of the composite character of a number of the books belonging to the Canon ; and here even so conservative a thinker as Sanday feels compelled to record himself as not differing from them.† With

* Ladd's *What is the Bible?* P. 19.

† See Sanday's *Bampton Lectures on Inspiration*, pp. 120-121.

reference to the question of inerrancy they are likewise of one mind—a question upon which Lindsay, one of the most keenly thoughtful of our group of writers, does not hesitate to place himself upon the same side with them.* They all agree with Fairbairn, that “to attempt to make a multitude of books [such as we have in the Bible] into a single uniform authority, when almost all the books are, from the nature of the case, of different values, is the surest way to discredit even the most authoritative.”† Hence, in employing texts from the Scriptures, their importance and value are to be determined largely by the place they occupy in the Canon, or by the authority of the book from which they are taken. In other words, they all recognize the necessity of reading the Scriptures according to the new, historical or progressive method; they recognize the fact of the gradually unfolding character of the Revelation recorded, and in the use of the record endeavor to give due effect to its different stages, or appropriate setting to its several sections.

In all these points now referred to there will be seen that which is new, as compared with traditional conceptions. How far the new can be accepted as valid must be left to individual judgment for decision. The writers disclaim having any motive in re-stating the doctrine, except interest in the cause of faith and truth. They do not believe a loss of confidence in the Scriptures, or a destruction of their purpose and authority, to be consequent upon the adoption of their views; they do believe just the contrary. The better the correct idea of the Bible is known, the higher will be the appreciation of it as a means of grace, offering to every believer, in the various emergencies of his life, a servicable portion for his soul.‡ And in connection with such simple application of its words and truths to his own life, the believer may, by the scholarly and comprehensive study of its pages, rise to the highest and sublimest points

* See Lindsay's *Robertson Smith's Doctrine of Scripture*, p. 31.

† See Fairbairn's *Places for Christ in Mod. Theol.*, p. 508.

‡ See Ladd's *What is the Bible?* Pp. 480, 481.

of view from which to behold the character, history and destiny of man; from which to learn the character, methods and purposes of God, and from which the mutual relationship between God and man may be most reliably ascertained.

2. Here then there is suggested to us the second of the doctrines to be brought under notice, namely, that of God and man with reference to the interpretation of their mutual relationship. The "newer religious thinking" does not reject the great truths respecting God and man, developed by the theologians of the past, though it has discarded many of their favorite words and phrases. The triune character of the eternal Godhead, for instance, is held to be indisputably valid; and the practical value of the doctrine of the Trinity is duly acknowledged. Man is looked upon as bearing the impress of God's likeness; and though marred by sin, as retaining the possibilities of restoration under the helpful power of divine grace. The divine attributes, or as one of the most discriminating minds in the Reformed Church prefers, "the divine properties," are likewise believed in as belonging to God. Not to doctrines like these it is, that our authors regard it desirable to give new form, but rather to the idea of relationship as altered by the progress of thought. We have something of an illustration of this in the history of that transition which made Saul of Tarsus, Paul the Apostle! Prior to his conversion we know that Hebrew of the Hebrews "looked upon God as an exacting task-master; afterwards, his God was the God of Jesus, a benignant and gracious giver." It is by coming to Jesus just as Saul did, and learning of Him, that we can alone be brought to a correct apprehension of God's relationship to man, of man's relationship to God. All study about God and man, and their mutual relations, must begin and end in Jesus the Christ. He is the personal self-revelation of the everlasting Father in terms of humanity.

Happily there is a large and constantly increasing number to whom, as to those acquainted with Mercersburg and Lancaster Theology, this insistence of centrality for Christ will appear

neither new nor strange. But there are others of whom this cannot be said. The determining principles of the systems of divinity ingrained in their nature, are the divine decrees, the sovereignty of God, His glory and unapproachable kingship, or the headship of a stern and inexorable governmental regime. Every one knows how in religion all things are colored by the particular conceptions of God that are held by men.* When his relation is conceived of according to the kingly idea, Bradford, in the incisive style which gives such a crisp freshness to the atmosphere of his book, declares "God is looked upon as great, glorious, awful, doing His own will without care for the puny creatures beneath Him, and human life is dismal, hopeless. Where the idea of God as a supreme ruler prevails, the cold, distant, official relation may compel obedience, but will awaken no enthusiasm, awaken no love."† Under no conception of God's relation to man, except that taught by Jesus Christ, who is the way and truth for thought, no less than for salvation in a restricted sense, can one come to the full enjoyment of the benedictions which Christianity is intended to bestow.

Accordingly it is not to be wondered at that new interpretations of the relationship of God to man should be regarded as eminently desirable. Man's longing for deeper peace, and his deeper appreciation of "the primordial worth of the Son of

*"No greater intellectual or spiritual gain can be conceived for a man than that which is implied in a more vivid, just and inspiring conception of Him from whom his nature came, and with whom, by reason of that nature, he stands on essential relations. No object can be conceived more worthy the aim of a divine revelation than to give men precisely this uplift and advancement in the knowledge of their Creator. It has to do with their mental progress, in power and culture. It is intimately connected with the training of conscience, and of the sweetest and noblest affections. It concerns the regulation, and the fine inspiration, of the voluntary force. There is in fact no element in our energetic and complex nature which should not take beauty and blessing upon it from a clearer and larger apprehension of God."—*The Divine Origin of Christianity*, by Storrs, p. 35.

† See Bradford's *Spirit and Life*, pp. 121, 122.

Man,"* in the way of giving him an idea of God ministering to this peace, have conspired to produce the earnest efforts made to re-state this doctrine in terms faithful to Christ's own method, by standing, as it were, face to face with Him and conceiving God as He conceived Him. "The consciousness of Jesus Christ must be our guide, and His consciousness where it is clearest and most defined, in the belief as to God's Fatherhood. What God signified to Jesus Christ, He ought to signify to all Christian Churches."†

Interpreted according to this idea of Fatherhood, the relationship of God to man becomes at once as a Christian doctrine a great power to draw men toward Himself, that is an ethical and religious force of signal importance. For once God's Fatherhood is recognized, man's sonship is an immediate and necessary inference. Upon these mutually inclusive truths it is that one finds Maurice in his writings dwelling with such constant and unwearying emphasis. Who that has read his books does not remember how, over and over, he insists that in some true and really sympathetic and effectual sense God is the

* In Dr. Gerhart's *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, one of the richest and most comprehensive contributions to modern theological literature, there is this important passage: "Set amid new religious and civil conditions, an emancipated Church has during three centuries been unfolding the deeper meanings of the Christian Creed. The knowledge of Scripture has become more accurate, thorough and complete; and under the discipline of the Spirit there has come to personal faith a revelation of the primordial worth of the Son of Man such as the Church has not possessed since the Nicene age." Vol. I., p. viii.

† This quotation, taken from the volume of the Principal of Mansfield, suggests reference to what has been regarded by some as a departure in his system of thought from the Christocentric principle normative in our Reformed Theology. His conclusion is that "if we attempt to construct a theology which shall be faithful to the consciousness of Christ, the Fatherhood must be the determinative principle." But instead of a departure from, may it not be taken merely as an accurate statement of it? For Christian life the living Christ is centre and source; but may it not be at once preferable and more correct to say that for Christian thought, the consciousness of Christ, that is the Fatherhood of God, should be made source and centre of determining power? The distinction is a nice one, and worthy of consideration.

Father of all men, and that there never was a time when all men were not God's children?

With this far-reaching and important view of the relationship between God and man, our authors concur. The theory of adoption as enunciated in St. Paul's letters, when rightly interpreted, does not lend itself to the support of the opposing conclusions which are recorded by traditional theology. The word "adoption," as an abstract theological term, has been pressed into the service of wholly inadequate conceptions of the Christian privilege of sonship, and even to give a legal aspect to his whole relation to God. In view of all this the inquiry is made whether it would not be wise to allow the category of adoption to fall into desuetude and to express the truth about the relation of man to God in terms drawn from the language of our Lord's own teaching? In connection with this question, it is declared, upon grounds which seem valid, that whilst in Roman law adoption meant the investment of persons formerly not sons with some measure of filial status, the Greek word *υιοθεσία* in St. Paul's vocabulary meant the solemn investment of persons formerly sons in an imperfect degree, with a sonship worthy of the name, realizing the highest possibilities of filial honor and privilege.* Those who are persuaded as to the correctness of the distinction here drawn between the legal and the theological meaning of the word "adoption," will find no difficulty in allowing its use to be supplanted by words learned from the great Teacher Himself. This doctrine, then, of the Fatherhood of God, and of the sonship of man—not new, but expressed and insisted upon with new emphasis—is one of the features of the theological movement represented in the books whose views we are now examining, and the feature to which the movement delights often to recur.

3. In connection with this doctrine, there is brought to our

*The views here alluded to are developed in a chapter on Adoption, one of the most characteristic and suggestive contained in *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*. See pp. 188-204.

notice another to which in the next place we are to give attention, that, namely, of the Atonement. More and more it is coming to be recognized—so the claim runs—that the God against whom men have sinned is the loving Father of all rather than their arbitrary King or heartless Sovereign, and that they who have sinned against God are the beloved children of the common Father. The doctrine of the atonement, more than any other of the Faith, has been laden down with misconceptions and misrepresentations, some of which at least would have been avoided had the Fatherhood of God and the sonship of man been at all times duly accentuated.*

Among the older conceptions of the atonement there are not a few whose excesses or insufficiencies are due largely to their failure of making proper account of these facts. Certain representatives of Protestant scholastic orthodoxy have not hesitated to insist, for instance, that Christ's endurance of the wrath of God and the penalty of sin meant not only that the sinner was the object of God's extreme hatred, but that Christ, having identified Himself with man, shared that hatred with the sinner, and became the sufferer of the essence of eternal death! Those of our authors who criticise the doctrine thus taught as "unscriptural," "incredible," "shocking" to the Christian convictions of our day, can hardly be blamed for the impatience they display in the use of such epithets. The theories known by such phrases as "penal satisfaction," "juridical substitution," "moral imputation," and so forth, as well as that which

*To show the Scriptural grounds upon which this view rests one of our authors has this to say: "'God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son; 'He spared not His own Son, but delivered him up for us all; ' 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins.' What do these verses mean, if not that the essence and act of sacrifice was the surrender of the Son by the Father? It was the measure alike of His love to man, and the suffering He endured to save. And so we may say without Fatherhood there could have been no Atoner and no Atonement, but with the Fatherhood the Atoner and the Atonement could not but be." *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, pp. 484, 485.

regards the Cross as a mere contrivance for exhibiting the divine feeling in order to move men to repentance, may severally contain elements of truth not unimportant; but being limited, as they all are, to one or another aspect of the complex nature of the redemptive work of Christ, they may well be set aside by such new statements of the doctrine as approximate more nearly to an adequate representation of the facts involved.

"Approximate more nearly to adequacy" is an expression not unadvisedly chosen in this connection, for it is doubted whether a thoroughly sufficient explanation of the fact of the atonement is possible. It has been well said that "at every stage in the process which is generally summed up in the one word 'atonement' we are in the presence of forces which issue from infinity and pass out of our sight even while we are contemplating their effects."* This our authors believe, though they do not accept the theory of the atonement expounded in the essay from which the sentence is taken. And accordingly, without expecting their attempts to prove themselves the final solution of this involved and perplexing theological problem, they are endeavoring to make their accounts of the atonement consonant with the teachings of Christ and His Apostles, as these teachings are gathered by induction from the several passages of Scripture which refer to this particular phase of Christian truth.

The most systematic attempts in this direction among our group of authors are made by Bruce and Fairbairn in their helpful and suggestive chapters upon this topic. The course of their reasoning is along lines which are often far from being parallel to each other, but they frequently touch the same points, and in the end arrive at what for substance appears the same conclusion. The former finds the recorded instruction of Jesus on the doctrine of the Cross "very meagre, consisting at most of four lessons conveyed in very brief sayings." The first of these, the foundation upon which all the higher theological constructions of the Passion must rest, is that His death

* See Lyttelton's *Essay in Luz Mundi*, p. 237.

was the natural effect of fidelity to righteousness in an unrighteous world. The second, bequeathing to the Church in the word "ransom" a theological problem, without supplying it with a full solution, means that the death of Jesus, voluntarily endured, is somehow the means of delivering from death the souls of the many. The third, taught on the occasion of His anointing by Mary, implies that He died under the constraining power of self-denying love, similar to that shown by the ~~abandon~~ which led to the unrestrained use of the costly ointment. And the fourth, impressively conveyed by the utterance which accompanied the giving of the sacramental Cup at the institution of the Holy Supper ("This is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sin"), very clearly affirms His death to be of some sacrificial character.

In the epistles of St. Paul, whenever the meaning of Christ's death is contemplated, it is from the view-point of the last of the lessons He taught. He who is the representative at once of God and man makes *Himself* a sacrifice—a sacrifice whose virtue resides not in pain endured, or in blood shed, but rather "in the offering of a perfect will through the eternal spirit of holy love." Made according to the will of God, this sacrifice must be well-pleasing to God; and made by One who was in vital union with humanity, the sacrifice must exercise an emancipating influence beneficently altering in relation to God the spiritual attitude of a fallen race. Thus objectively conceived, the atonement is the method by which God has so judged sin in the very home of the sinful, as to achieve the salvation of the sinner. It exhibits God as a Being who does not need to be appeased or moved to mercy, but who in the Person of His Son suffers unto sacrifice that He may save. "The Atonement is the creation of grace—does not create it."

The objective achievement of this saving virtue in Christ's sacrifice must remain an abstract ideal or barren benefit, so long as divine forgiveness of personal sin is not realized through faith by the individual. The faith which transmutes the objective state of privilege into subjective experience, or turns an

ideal redemption into an actual one, has a more important function to perform than that of simply giving mental assent to the facts recorded as belonging to Christ's history upon earth; otherwise the Gospel would hardly have occasion to insist with such stern emphasis upon the necessity of faith in order to be saved. The function of faith cannot be restricted to the act of appropriating a benefit purchased by Christ. The description of faith as "a hand of the soul," reaching out in a mechanical way to receive "from a pierced hand" the gift of eternal life, would be prettier if it had more of truth in it! For Paul faith imposed the serious ethical task of dying in order to live. To this he refers in passages so often misapprehended: "I am crucified with Christ;" "If one died for all, then all died;" "There is now therefore no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, for the law of the Spirit of life hath made them free from the law of sin and death." In other words, just "as Christ in love made His own every detail in our unredeemed state, so faith in the exercise of its native clinging power makes its own every critical stage in Christ's redeeming experience—His death, His burial, His resurrection, His ascension,—and compels the redeemed man to re-enact these crises in His own spiritual history." The sum of all this is gathered by one of our authors into this richly significant utterance: "Christ as the Head, is the basis and symbol of a new mankind, and so of a new order or law for humanity. His obedience, as racial while personal, is the cause of a collective righteousness, which cancels for the irresponsible and guiltless the evil of collective sin. But as regards the guilty and responsible, it makes the salvation of no man actual, but of all men possible, dependent on conditions that men must fulfill. The righteousness which is without works is not without faith, and so the possible salvation is realized by him who believeth. Hence, even under it, man remains free, responsible, saved by grace, but through faith."

In the foregoing analysis of the two chapters above referred to, and from which its thoughts and quotations are taken,

effort has been made neither to hold their views apart, nor to indicate from which of them this or that particular idea has been appropriated. The aim has not been to show the peculiarities of each, but the points of agreement in both. They agree it is plain in rejecting those theories of the atonement which would make it merely an external judicial or commercial transaction. They set aside the notion of the possibility of saving the guilty simply through the outward imputation or substitution of another's righteousness. They emphasize the value and significance of the sacrificial life and death of Jesus, but they insist at the same time that salvation is to be attained only on the ground of a real, living organic union with Christ. The believer, one with Christ through faith, is regarded righteous, and whilst resting upon Jesus as the Saviour from sin, he lives according to "the law of the Spirit of life," and thus through loving, obedient "fellowship with Christ in His sufferings," is made more and more Christ-like in his own life and character.

Those given to the disparagement of the value of these profound Christian doctrines for so-called practical purposes, should be invited in this connection to observe the immense advantage these views of the atonement have over most of the traditional conceptions. They insure immeasurably superior ethical and religious results in the individual. The Church in all ages has been mourning over "the unseemly spectacle presented by professed believers, who, whilst looking to Christ for magical deliverance from guilt and wrath, show no devotion to Him as the Lord, and no trace of that all-pervading moral sensitiveness which one expects to see in a Christian." Such spectacles, at once the ridicule and the stumbling-blocks of an observing world, could hardly be so common were the true idea of faith in its relation to the atonement more generally the conscious possession of those who profess and call themselves Christians.

The newer ethical view of the atonement would tend also to correct the mistakes which short-sighted evangelists in our day so generally make. Their eagerness to win men to the side of

Christ prompts them to make the condition of faith as easy as possible. They care little about the quality of faith, only so some kind of faith of which Christ is the object can be speedily awakened. They think of justification, but forget sanctification. They deem it the one thing needful to bring every sinner to a state of peace, instead of aiming at rousing the conscience of the sinful into energetic activity, and then leaving them, as they well may be left, in the hands of God. They give attention only to the beginning of the Christian life, and forget to insist upon the continuous necessity of using the provision divinely made for its support and progress. Under the light of a true conception of the atonement and related doctrines, such one-sided preaching would make way for that "which would offer Christ to men's faith as He is offered in the New Testament, in Christ's own teaching and life,"* and include insistence upon the necessity on the believer's part of faithfully employing the appointed means of grace through life.

4. From the consideration of the last topic we are led now to notice in conclusion the doctrine of the Holy Communion of the Lord's Supper, which in its institution was so closely associated with the death of Christ, and His own teaching as to the nature and design of His death. Our books contain no definite or systematic exposition of this particular doctrine; but incidental references to it are not infrequent. From these references it is not difficult to ascertain, with some degree of accuracy, the views generally held by these writers.

For one thing it is evident that, with possibly a single exception, they are all equally averse, on the one hand, to the conception taught by the Church of Rome, and those in other churches who ape after Rome, and, on the other hand, to the conception of those who regard the ordinance merely as a commemorative act, or symbolical rite. The Holy Supper is taken to be less

*The practical value of sound doctrinal conceptions is most forcibly developed in the concluding paragraphs of the chapter from which this and the last preceding quotations are taken. Those paragraphs are specially commended, and will repay the most careful study. See *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, pp. 165-183.

than a propitiatory sacrifice to God for sin; more than a memorial celebration that recalls simply an incident in the Saviour's life on earth. It is not a Divine institution, designed in an *ex opere operato* manner to convey spiritual substance from God to man, but it is a means of grace to those whose hearts give the response of faith to the offer which the Redeemer makes.

Whilst standing between these extremes, some of our authors show very decided inclination toward the purely memorial conception which it is often said Zwingli entertained. Munger, for instance, says that "the Lord's Supper is the Gospel in form, the whole Gospel without which no man can be saved. Christ is our bread, and his blood is the wine of our life, broken and shed in the sacrifice of love. To enter by faith into that sacrifice and make it our own, that is, repeat it in ourselves, is the whole Gospel, and we read it anew as we behold and partake." So far as it goes, this statement recognizes in beauty of phrase somewhat of the objective side of the doctrine without which, it is believed, no satisfactory statement of it can be made. But it hardly meets the requirement of going far enough, notwithstanding its perceptible leanings in the right direction. The estimate which Bruce puts upon this Christian institution is learned from where his pages say that "in the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ we remember the one sacrifice which effectually dealt with the problem of sin; declare our obligation to Him who redeemed us, and our devotion to His service; acknowledge that we are a brotherhood bound to walk in love; and honor love crucified as the most worshipful thing in the universe."* Were the Sacrament, as suggested by the etymology of this word, simply a solemn oath on man's part of fidelity and consecration to Him whose sacrifice for man is recalled in the use of the bread and wine of the Supper, this language would admirably declare its meaning. Every word said is true; but it is not the whole truth, and not the most important part of it. The name of Fairbairn represents the possible exception above referred to, to these writers standing between the extremes indicated. In

* See Bruce's *The Kingdom of God*, p. 251.

view of the many brilliant features of his volume, one is disappointed to find the conception of the sacraments as non-grace-bearing expressed by implication, at least, in his book.* The connection in which this is done should, however, be remembered. He has no sympathy with the arrogant assumptions of Roman and Anglican divines who teach that a man must be incorporated into a branch of the Church having "apostolic succession," and incorporated by the hands of its own duly ordained ministry, in order to be truly and effectually saved. And when making emphatic repudiations of such theories of the Church and the Ministry, he is led to declare also against the doctrine of grace as communicable by the Sacrament. Had he come to the notice of the subject from another point of view, it is not at all improbable that a more satisfactory statement of it would have been given.

At all events, such views are exceptional to the movement we are now studying. The effort of those who are contributors to it is, as regards the doctrine of the Communion, to set it forth in the light of ethical principles, that is, to show that the ordinance is intended to accomplish through man's will its peculiar purpose, rather than by way of communicating some subtle spiritual essence, either "in, with and under," or alongside of the outward elements that are employed. The Holy Supper stands as an expression of the idea of a real, living, moral and spiritual union of the believer with the Lord Jesus Christ, a union objectively accomplished for the race through the Incarnation of the Son of God, and subjectively realized through the vital bond of faith. When Jesus gave utterance to the sublime words, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you; he that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life," He had in mind, no doubt, the necessity, on the part of the believer, of appropriating the divine life which He had brought into touch with humanity, the necessity of appropriating also the principles of righteousness and truth which resided in Him alone, and which, therefore, could be received

* See Fairbairn's *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, pp. 517-519.

from Him only. Thus interpreted, the hardness of His saying, which caused many of the first disciples to stumble and leave Him, is changed into a saying of tender and attractive beauty, before whose truthfulness believers responsively bow and live.

This giving of Himself by Jesus the Christ, and this receiving by those organically united with Him through faith, is signified and sealed in the solemn ordinance of the Christian Altar. Two things the doctrine thus enunciated seeks to emphasize: *One* of them is that in the celebration of the Holy Communion there is given the divine pledge of nurture and support for our spiritual life, and accompanying the pledge, that which corresponds to it. If this were not so, there would be no communion of Christ with the believer in the Supper, and the whole ordinance would be robbed of the very feature which gives its deepest spiritual significance, and conveys the loftiest Christian joy. There is spiritual nourishment for the believer in the Sacramental Feast, but it comes by the Holy Spirit from the glorified Saviour to those in whom He lives and who live in Him. The *other* matter emphasized in the above view is the response which this divine pledge conveyed in the Holy Supper is calculated to awaken in the believer. The knowledge of God's good will toward us in Christ Jesus, as signified by Him in the Communion and confirmed, as it were, by solemn oath on His part, serves the purpose of awakening a similar disposition on our part, and calls forth a similar confirming oath from our own hearts. "We love Him because He first loved us." In the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper this love for Christ is publicly declared by the communicant, allegiance to Christ and His cause is solemnly avowed, and a renewal of consecration to His principles and service is fervently made. Thus, this new theological movement, whilst avoiding the extremes advocated by the older systems, conserves the objective and subjective features of the Holy Communion in a doctrine whose form, for the adherents of the movement, at least, is more satisfying than those which have been handed down from other times. That it will prove itself to be equally so to all the readers of these books is hardly to be expected.

IV.

EXTRACTS FROM GIOBERTI.

BY REV. CHARLES C. STARBUCK.

III.

God is infinite productivity (pure act). He produces within or without. Trinity and creation. But He cannot make anything else than Himself. The creative act, which in its root is the pure act, has for term itself. The creative act is then theogonic. God makes Himself infinitely or finitely. Infinitely, generation and procession of the divine persons. Finitely, He creates the world. The world is an imperfect, inchoate God. Cosmogony is a theogony: Hesiod is right.

Strauss is frivolous when he deduces from the antinomies of the Gospel that it is false. Such antinomies are everywhere in Christianity, in its morals, in its dogma, in its history, etc.; and they are the criterion of its truth, because apparent antinomy is the character of the true.

When we speak of the union of contradictories in God, we use equivocal language. The contradictories identify themselves in God, because in Him they are not contradictories, because they put off that which makes the contradiction. This resides in the finiteness; because every contradiction supposes plurality and hence reciprocal limitation. Now the contradictories of the finite transferred into the infinite lose their plurality, their limits, and hence their contradiction. Therefore, speaking properly, we ought not to say that in God the contradictories identify themselves, but that the unity of God imports all that which there is of positiveness in the contradictories.

Such is the sense in which we ought to understand the principle of Nicholas of Cusa. The German pantheists, and especially Hegel, admit on the contrary in God a true plurality, and hence an absurd union of contradictories, because they transport into God Himself the finite reality of the created contradictories. Hence it is that Hegel identifies in God being and nothing. Now nothing is the absolute contradictory; and the absolute contradictory having nothing positive, and being, as Hegel says, absolute negativity, is the only thing which is not found in God, because it does not exist anywhere. The only contradictories which identify themselves in God are the relative; that is, those which have a measure of positiveness; but they identify themselves in God by putting off their relativity and limitation. For the same reason there are not found in God evil and pain; because these are negative and absolute, not positive and relative contradictories.

Dante, Par. XXVIII, depicts God as a point of infinite littleness, but shining with great force. Thus to express the simplicity, he excludes utterly the mathematical infinite; and to indicate the virtue, he attributes to it the dynamical infinite.

The existence of God is infinite in the order of knowledge, as in that of reality. Therefore it is postulate, axiom, theorem, corollary, hypothesis. To it is applicable every species of cognition and of proof and of demonstration. The logic of the infinite is not divided in its processes as that of the finite. God is idea (light), judgment (word), reasoning (reason), method (way). All that which is divided in the orders of the finite is united in those of the infinite. God is immense in logic as in nature.

God is free, because fatality implies a limitation and subordination. Now the divine nature is not limited, nor subordinated; then it is free. It is not limited and subordinated in respect to itself, because infinite and supreme by essence. It is not so towards the creatures, because these proceed from it; now to limit the divine liberty and fatally enchain it they would have to precede it. The conception of necessary crea-

tion is a contradiction. The liberty of God is unlimited, or, to speak more precisely, is not limited except by this liberty itself. God can do everything, save to limit or destroy his own liberty, for if He could do this He would not be free. But as all of the properties of the divine nature are mutually identical, it follows that He cannot overthrow them in virtue of His liberty itself. But as to created things God is the absolute master of them, because otherwise the finite would be a term to the infinite.

So far is infinity from excluding the divine personality that on the contrary it presupposes it. The infinity of God would not be perfect if it were not one, and would not be one if it were not personal. Personality is the possession of self; and this possession is the greater the less it is possessed by any other thing. God, the infinite unity, that is, possesses itself infinitely, as appears from its identity with the infinite; and it is not possessed by anything else. On this account it is not limited. Now the sole thing which opposes itself to the infinite personality is limitation. Determination is limitation if it is extrinsic, as that which comes from our spirit. But it excludes limitation if it is intrinsic. Then personal determination does not oppose itself to infinity. The infinite determines itself as infinite; here is its personality.

The absurdity of the actual numerical infinite appears from this, that every part of it excludes the infinity of the whole and hence destroys the hypothesis. I explain myself. If there are infinite worlds, there must be an infinite number of globes made like Jupiter. Now Saturn is not like Jupiter; therefore if Saturn were like Jupiter the number of Jovial globes would be greater still, therefore the actual number of Jupiters is not infinite. It is seen from this example that, in an infinite number of unities specifically diverse, each of them limits all the others, and forbids that they should be actually infinite. This absurdity is not found in the possible numerical infinite, because possibles do not exclude each other mutually like real existences. Then the possible infinity is the only infinity which is congruous to the universe.

The creation of the contingent in harmony with the necessary is that which constitutes morality.

The obscene and the ferocious are the two chief heads, and I might almost say, the bifarious ideal of guilt. They proceed from the two disorderly affections of dishonest love and of hatred. They are anti-cosmic, destructive, tending to nothingness, contrary to the second creative cycle (the cycle of the advancing palingenesis) because they aim at the extinction of life. Obscenity extinguishes life in the germ; cruelty extinguishes it when already actuated. All the defects and failings of man, however trifling, have respect to these two supreme disorders, and as they grow lead to them. The essence of immorality is destruction, nothingness. Its virtue is creative act; vice is destructive act, and as it were an anti-creation, a negation of the second creative cycle. Virtue is to create, imitating the divine act; vice is to destroy.

Leopardi grieves that things are shadows. He is right, because things are mimesi. But the shadow presupposes the body, and the mimesi implies the metessi.

Jesuit genius hates the future. The essence of the modern Jesuit is the hatred of thought; that is, of the summit of reality. Hence the hatred of civil progress, which is mentality growing and extrinsicated. The hatred of the sciences, and especially of philosophy; the hatred of liberty; the hatred of religion in *spirit and in truth*, which they turn into superstition. Hence I have said, that in philosophy they tend to sensism; in religion, to gentilism; in politics, to barbarism. Hence, to the puerile, because the child has not yet attained to the age of reason; to the feminine, because reason is less strong in the woman than in man; to the doting and decrepit, because in age the faculties become weak and return towards childhood; to the vulgar and the courtier-like, because the people and the great, the porters and the courtiers, agree in aversion to thought. Whence, the hatred towards the Jesuits in the middle class, which is the thinking and dialectical community, and in limited or tempered governments, in which the middle class predominates. Hence

the affection for them of the rude democracy of certain Swiss cantons, of the despotic monarchy of little and divided States, because these governments agree in killing thought. Hence their love of the soft affections which unnerve thought, and their hatred of the manly sentiments which strengthen it. This explains, also, their good parts; because, if we well regard it, they love good not as good, but for the exclusion of a greater good. Thus they favor letters through hatred of the severe sciences, because the sciences are more mental. They would celebrate steam, if they could get rid of printing. Among the sciences they prefer the physical and mathematical, to the civil and the philosophical. Among poems, they prefer the frivolous to the serious. In eloquence, they prefer mediocrity to greatness. They love the classics, but for the form. Or, if they love them for the matter, it is to exclude the modern by the ancient; because the modern implies progress, and the ancient stationariness. And in the ancient they seek the spoils of the old, rather than the germs of the new.

To the schema of the universe corresponds the anti-schema. The steresis, *στερεσις*, or privation, corresponds to the metessi (*μεθεξις*), or full participation. Hell is a steresis total, final and immanent. The devils, the reprobates, are minds become steretic, *i. e.*, void of metessi. The total and final steresis is guilt and pain. Guilt and pain are not two distinct things, but two faces of one and the same thing. This one thing is the steresis, *i. e.*, the total privation of the metessi. The true theory of penalty, temporal, and also that of hell (ultramundane and immanent penalty), consists in the identity of the guilt and of the pain. Thus, *e converso*, paradise is the identity of virtue and of pleasure, that is, beatitude. The steresis is the anti-schema concrete and individuate.

A philosophy of nature, founded on the dogma of creation, might easily accept many doctrines of the pantheists; whose grand error is, to apply to the artificer that which only applies to his work.

Simplicity and identity are two very different things. Right

sense shows us the first in nature, and counsels us to transfer it into works of art, and especially into science; but the second is not found outside of God. The Identity is the property of Being, and simplicity of existence. Created simplicity is the image and the metessi of the uncreated identity. Identity is an infinite simplicity; simplicity is a finite identity. Now the finite includes the multiplex, the diverse; this, then, is not to be excluded from created simplicity. The science of to-day, essentially pantheistic, confounding God with the universe, must needs find in the latter the qualities of the former. Identity is among these. Hence all these systems of the cell, of the globicine, of the vesicle, of elementary spirality, which have rained down from Germany into France. There are elements of truth in such systems; but the truth in them is exaggerated and becomes absurd. Because, if everything is substantially identical, whence originate the appearances of diversity? From the transformations, say they. But the very idea of transformation includes diversity; because that which is truly identical cannot transform itself. Link will have it, that everything is cellule; Goethe, that every part of the vegetable is leaf; Raspail, that everything is a vesicle, etc. But they do not perceive that if there is not originally some diversity in the leaves, in the cellules, in the vesicles, their various metamorphoses would be impossible. The system of identity is founded in a false metaphysics. The true shows us that perfect identity is the property solely of the infinite; and that in the finite the unity is inseparable from the multiplicity, and the diversity from the identity. What in fact is diversity, if not the infinite identity imitated piece by piece, broken, so to speak, into fragments? This is how the principle of creation shows us that the essence of the created force resides of necessity in the synthesis of the one with the multiplex, and of the identical with the diverse.

All the pantheists reject the personal God; as if the God of Christianity were such. But the God of Christianity is not personal like man, because He is one and still has three persons.

The individuality of God is His infinite unity. Christianity shows to us the personal God solely in the incarnate Word. And here the image accords with the truth. Precisely that which justifies and renders credible the mystery of the incarnation is its human necessity. Because without it the true God was not accessible to the heart and to the imagination of men. These faculties could not appease themselves save at the expense of the truth; as in idolatry and in polytheism. The incarnation reconciles dialectically truth and human need.

According to the Hegelians the human spirit is God; who, after having extrinsicated and limited himself in nature, is returning to himself. In this there is truth and falsehood. The falsehood is, that the created spirit is God himself. The truth is, that the created spirit is the image of God, is a finite God, is the endeavor of the finite toward the infinite, of existence toward Being, and hence the summit, the complement of the world and minister of the second creative cycle. The world, in fact, does come from the infinite and go to the infinite, according to the two cycles of the ideal course. It comes from the infinite by way of the creation, and returns to the infinite by way of the spirit (genius and virtue). But as between the creative act and the effect, the interval is infinite; even so is it between the spirit and the infinite to which it returns. It returns through approximation and identification.

The idea of nature expresses neither a simple aggregate nor an individual, but signifies a unity intermediate between the distinct unity of the one and the concrete unity of the other. Such intermediate unity is the *metessi*. Scotus Erigena, and others, distinguished two natures; that is, *naturans* and *naturata*. By *natura naturans* the pantheists understand the absolute; but they deceive themselves. It is the *metessi*, as *natura naturata* is the sensible world, the *mimesi*. There are then three distinct things: the type of nature, that is, the Logos, the Idea, God; nature *naturans* and intelligible, i. e., the *metessi*; and nature *naturata* and sensible, i. e., the *mimesi*. *Natura naturans* produces *natura naturata*, as the intelligible produces

the sensible by the medium of the concreative act. The "soul of the world" of the ancients is a confusion of God with nature *naturata* and mimetic. But if you reverse the pantheistic conception, and poetic personification, it is the *natura naturans*, i. e., the metessi.

The will and the intellect are the two poles of the human spirit. Reunited, they form the pure mentality of the metessi. Disjoined, the will becomes affection (sensibility) and forms the mimesi. They are in the psychical order that which light and fire are in the physical. Light and fire are elements, poles, of one principle. Light preserves and fire destroys; that makes paradise and this hell. Harmonized by God they make perfection. God is *first* equality, because He is the dialectical principle which harmonizes contraries. Man here below is in a state of *inequality*, because the will and the mind are not altogether harmonized. *Fire* is the symbol of the infernal punishment, which consists in the desire of the infinite eternally frustrated. Hell is the man without palingenesia, without metessi, without the end of the second creative cycle. Hence, as light and fire are one and the same principle, so paradise and hell and purgatory are made of one sole element, that is, of the desire of the infinite; which desire satisfied is paradise, frustrated without hope is hell, frustrated with hope is purgatory.

Sense is the initial reason; reason is the complete sense.

Virtue is the mimesi of holiness, earthly glory is mimesi of the heavenly; both together of beatitude. The root of the appetite of glory is the metessic and concrete unity of all intelligences. It is not then vain in itself, although the application of it may be vain. Glory consists in two things: (1) in creation; (2) in the recognition of this creation by all intelligences. It contains then two principles: the one individual and real, the other ideal and universal. Man desires to be creator and that his creation should reverberate in the mirror of all minds, that it should be known, that it should be idea. These two desires root themselves in that of the infinite. Man would create, because to create is a motion toward the infinite; he does not

content himself with being the only witness of his own creation, because he feels that his own spirit is finite, wherefore he wishes a theatre universal, infinite. He wishes that the drama created by him may appear upon an infinite stage, and may become an infinite idea. False asceticism, by repudiating all glory, destroys the nature of the mind and one of its noblest instincts. Religion ought to regulate the idea of glory, not extinguish it. False glory consists in substituting the celebrity of destruction for that of creation. Man desires glory, because he craves to become idea, to pass over from the sensible to the intelligible state, from the mimetic to the metessic state, and in order that the passing effects of his second creation may become perpetual and immanent.

Motion is the endeavor of the mimesi to simultaneize time and simplify (concentrate in one sole point) space. This would come to pass if the motion were infinite. It is then the external endeavor of the mimesi toward the metessi.

The three modes of time, past, present, future, express the three relations of existence; that is, the nothingness out of which it issues (past), the finiteness in which it is (present), and the infinite to which it runs by the way of explication without ever being able completely to attain it (future).

Parmenides lays down that the known must needs be similar to the knower. A great principle, connected with his other, that thought and being are one thing. This proves that the object known is intelligence. On this account all the beings which are apprehended of us only as sensible are implicit intelligences.

Man would fain have here a science entirely one, complete, in which the superintelligible should be intelligible. Therefore pantheism and rationalism, which give themselves the air of clearing up everything, please at first view. But such promises and pretensions are inconsistent with the actual condition of science, which must needs correspond with the present condition of the world. Now the world is in the state of mimesi, therefore science cannot be metessic, as it would have to be if it were perfect. The aforesaid philosophers confound the science pos-

sible to us, mimetics, with the metessic and ultramundane science. The endeavor of the mimetic man to render himself metessic before the time, is pride; the first or rather the only sin. Various attempts of this: The *Eritis sicut dii* said to Adam. The "let us make us a tower," etc., of Babel; whence the *cælum petimus stultitia* of the poet. The heaven contrasted with the earth is a symbol of the metessi contrasted with the mimesi. Man is, indeed, destined to draw near to God; but he will never overtake Him. The mysteries, the superintelligibles, are breathing-places of metessic science revealed to us a *superiori* by the telescope of revelation in our mimetic life. The metessic point to which they refer is the unknown essence.

The ultramundane life is the passage from the waking state to a state which unites the advantages of this with those of sleep, perfect interiority with perfect exteriority, liberty, reason, consciousness with the prerogatives of instinct. The waking state, that is, the earthly life, cannot be the definitive and final state of man, because it is periodically interrupted by a regress toward sleep, which is the embryonic life, and is therefore a mere antagonism toward the waking life. It must therefore needs be succeeded by another life at death. Death is called sleep in the Scriptures, because it has in common with sleep the separation of the individual from the earthly and atmospheric life, by concentrating it within itself. But at the same time it is a reawakening to another life. It is sleep in respect to the earth; it is reawakening in respect to heaven. See how the phenomenon of sleep casts light also on the palingenesiac life.

The bodies which are called inorganic tend to unite in crystalline form, that is, with faces angularly inclined; whereas the astronomical bodies without excluding the earth have a spheroidal form. In the one the right line prevails, in the other the curve peculiar to the organic kingdoms. Does not this prove that every planet is a true organism as a complex whole, and is more metessic than a part of its components? And that hence the ancients do not err in likening them to animals?

"The animal," says Decandolle, "distinguishes itself from

the vegetable by having the consciousness of itself." Yes, say I, sensitive consciousness, not intellective; consciousness of itself, not of the absolute. This is one of the most imperfect grades of the natural metessi and mentality. Descartes made of animals so many machines, and he was right, because the animals are Cartesians, placing in their own being the root of their own thought, and Cartesianism, being mechanical, is properly the philosophy of the beasts.

Opposites appertain to the mimesi. The mimesi is in a state of intrinsic combat, which is born of the inchoate development of its force. The first creative act is divisive, and produces the strife of contraries. It divides itself into various epochs. Three with respect to the earth: inorganic, pre-adamitic, adamitic. Whether there shall be a post-adamitic epoch is uncertain. The life of the world in these three epochs is a course, an incessant effort toward the infinite. The mimesi goes on diminishing and drawing near to the metessi. The second creative and dialectical act will be the palingenesia. It will end time. The opposites will be pacificated in the metessi, which is the finite possession of the infinite, as the idea is the infinite possession of the infinite, *i. e.*, the infinite itself.

The solid is the mimesi of individuation or actuation, and the fluid of potency. Hence the grand duality of the globes and of the luminous and calorific ether, as it were a celestial atmosphere. Between the globes and the ether intervene the nebulae in their various forms, in which the ether begins to condense and conglobate itself. The potency, which is vague, uncircumscribed, infinite, like the species and germs, begins to actuate itself by concentrating itself in one particular point and mode of space and of time. Thus, solidification is the tendency of the fluid to a centre. Condensation is an initial solidification: it implies a growth of the reciprocal cohesion of the parts, which in the fluid is nothing or very slight. The centralization of the solidifying fluid brings about the motion of its molecules around a centre. This concentrative motion at first is more crude; it does not take place through curved lines, but through poly-

onal projections; because the polygon is an imperfect circle, a compromise between the straight line and the curve. Then the polygon becomes a circle. In the crystallized minerals the polygonal form prevails; in animals the circular. In the vegetables both, but the second rather than the first. The universe divides itself into globes, ether and nebulae; which is as much as to say metessically, into acts, into potencies, and into a transit from the latter to the former. Motion is the mimetic vehicle of the transit, and expresses the endeavor of the forces. Every globe is a great individual, but in which the individuality is not perfect. Hence in it there are contained many species of more elaborated individuals: crystals, plants, animals. The complete individual is that in which harbors a free mind. Such is man. Man then is the supreme individuality of the terrestrial world. The various globes are in association among themselves, by the medium of the ethereal fluid; which is to say that the various forms of mimesi are united by the initial metessi. The commerce of the various globes is effected by the free minds which metessically participate in one sole idea as mimetically in one and the same sun, in one common light. The intellect and the light are the instruments of this companionship, of this religion; whence in the Biblical and Dantesque idiom *sight* is the mimesi of intelligence. Hence two sister and communicative sciences of the various worlds: the ideal science (philosophy and religion) which unites the minds, and astronomy which by way of the eyes binds together the family of the stars in the vast plain of the heavens. This relationship of astronomy to the ideal science explains the error of judicial astronomy and of Sabeism.

Motion is the bond of time and space. When the motion has become infinite all the instants unify themselves in one sole instant and all the points in one sole point, space and time mingle in the pure unity of the continuum. Motion is the endeavor of the mimesi toward the metessi, and of the finite and divided chronotope toward the infinite and one. The celerity is the measure of such endeavor.

The only difference that prevails between man and the other beings is that in these mentality is instinctive and fated, in men conscious and free. Now, the mentality of the first species implies a less grade of explication. Mentality goes on unfolding itself to infinity unequally in the various created beings. One in essence potentially, it is various and unequal actually. In this way the Origenian equality of the creation conciliates itself with the inequality attested by experience, by the faith, and necessary to the conception of order. Mentality, conscious and free, is the summit of the cosmic order of the earth. But it is not the absolute summit, inasmuch as there comes in place of it the paligenesiatic order, which will move in a new indefinite exaltation of knowledge and of free activity, *i.e.*, of the concreation. All the universe, therefore, is animate, because the internal aspect of the parts and of the whole is mentality.

Civilization is born of religion, and to religion it reconducts men. These are the two religious and civil cycles. Religion is beginning and end, basis and completion of civilization. But the religion which creates civilization (religion of the Middle Ages) is potential and mimetic; the religion which completes civilization is actual and metessic. *Religion creates civilization* is the cycle of the Middle Ages. *Civilization reconducts to religion* is the cycle of the future age. At present civilization and religion are at war. But the motion of civilization toward religion begins to make itself felt, and presages their dialectical reconciliation.

"Aristotle . . . not only says that those who have their flesh soft and delicate are of good genius, but affirms also in the *Problems* that no one was ever surpassingly excellent in any art or science, who was not melancholy by nature, likening the diverse and most marvellous effects of melancholy to the diverse and most marvellous effects of wine." (VARCHI). Melancholy, like ennui, is the need of the metessic life; it is the aspiration of the earthly man toward the life of heaven, the instinct of the metessi to which he is destined, the consciousness that in heaven alone is his true country. Hence Leopardi observes

that ennui is the only thing which is not vain, because it in fact is nothing else than the reasonable effect of the mimetic vanity, and a rising of the soul towards its metessic destination. Leopardi says of ennui that which Aristotle says of melancholy, that is, that it predominates above all and almost continually in great geniuses, and is their habitual state, because great geniuses are more metessic. Hence the infelicity of these great geniuses noted by Leopardi, which is an effect of their greatness. The men of soft and delicate flesh are of greater genius, precisely because their mind being less oppressed by the body is more metessic, and their body, so to speak, is more spiritual. Wine, with all excitants, used temperately, produces an effect similar to that of melancholy and awakens the genius, because it awakens and concentrates the forces of the life and above all the nervous system. Now the life is a metessic thing, and the nerves are the most metessic part of the organism.

The new without the old is false scientifically, ugly esthetically, impious religiously, frivolous and not durable practically and civilly, immoral ethically, displeasing and disgusting and puerile to the sense. The exclusive progressives and regressives are then equally sophistical and are in the wrong alike. The foreign, the new, which is not rooted in the old, is a vain appearance, rather, it is nothing. The old without the new is a thing dead, useless, inefficacious, and therefore biologically it is also nothing. Existence, reality, is new and old at once in all orders of things.

Absurd as it is to desire that the dead, that is the accidental parts of antiquity should revive, it is equally vain to endeavor to hinder the other parts from returning. Even thoughts, feelings, customs, have the hope of a resurrection.

The Christian principle; that the contemplative excels the active life, is supremely philosophical. But it ought not to be understood ascetically. Because the action set over against contemplation is sensuous action. The true contemplation is supreme ideal action.

The immortality of the soul is proved by two things: (1) by

the teleology of the world; because the earth would fail of an end if thought were extinguished; (2) by the perennity of existence. The mimesi alone ceases: now thought is metessi. In place of saying that that which begins ends, it ought to be said that nothing which begins ends; because otherwise to begin would be useless. To end is only to pass from the non-intelligent to the intelligent. Immortality or the palingenesiac life is the dialectical harmony of earthly life and death. Life and death are in opposition by way of the mimetic, i. e., sensible element; take away this element and they revert to one and the same thing. Beginning and end are modes of time; take away succession and they resolve themselves into one continuous immanence. The error lies in forming an earthly idea of immortality, supposing it successive and as it were a continuation of the cosmic life. It is not postmundane, but supramundane, as appertaining to the continuum.

Leopardi is astonished that man here below is not happy, and takes occasion of this fact to deny Providence. But felicity would be inconsistent with the condition of the earthly life, which is the journey and not the goal. Felicity imports repose, quiet, immanence, and can only appertain to the end. Now the end, teleology, is inconsistent with the earthly life, as being that which is situated in time. The idea of time excludes that of goal, of repose, of end, and hence of beatitude. The earthly man is a finite god who is but commencing. He is situated in the mimetic, and not in the metessic state. Now felicity is inconsistent with the mimesi. Felicity implies intimate and immanent possession of things. Now the mimesi cannot possess *intimately*, because it attaches itself to the bark of things (sensible), and cannot penetrate the medulla, the essence. The mimesi cannot possess *continuously* because it is *temporaneous*.

The discrete element of the chronotope is analytic and divisive. Created thought thrown into the discrete no longer possesses life and the idea except broken up into points and instants; which is the infinitely little. Hence arise infelicity

and ennui. It is probable that the reprobate, being frustrated of the palingenesiac complement of the second creative cycle, will never enter into the immanent state, and will not issue out of the discrete. Their punishment will consist in an infinite and desperate ennui, that is in a journey eternal and without goal. Ennui engenders impatience. Impatience is born of the nullity of time and the need of preoccupying eternity. Ennui engenders melancholy, which is the sentiment of the vanity of created things. Solomon's *vanitas vanitatum* is born of the temporaneous and mimetic state of the actual world. All here is vain, because it pains, because it is bark, mere rind. *Præterit figura hujus mundi*, says St. Paul; behold time which flees, and the mimesis which is a shade. The opposite of vanity is substantiality. This consists in two things; in the immanence which excludes the flux, and in the essence which excludes the superficiality. The immanent apprehension of the essences is the true possession of things, necessary to the felicity of man. Such a possession is the metessi. The metessi possesses the infinite essence and the finite essences. Our thought here below has a metessic spring, by means of the reason, the memory, the imagination and revelation, which *præcipiunt* in a certain measure the continuum, the essences, the infinite.

V.

THE ARYAN RACE.*

BY REV. G. D. GURLEY.

In the acquisition of topographical knowledge it is greatly advantageous to gain a commanding altitude from which the eye can sweep the whole domain—survey the area in its unity. An analogous fact obtains in the domain of history. It is a vast gain to its understanding and enjoyment to get an Eifel-tower view point, whence not only the concourse of Nations, but also the Races are recognized as actors of related parts in the same drama—the Drama of World History. Race History reduces the characters (*dramatis personæ*) to four or five. To follow the leading character brings almost the entire stage and plot under review. Such distinctive honor we think Providence assigned the Aryans. Or, to vary the figure, the study of a Race History is like following one of the Union armies, as the Potomac or the Tennessee, in our Civil War. The Aryan is, as we think our story proves, the grandest corps in the army of our battling humanity.

The term Race has a double signification. On account of paucity of terms it has been appropriated by Ethnology and linguistics. As employed by one it is not identical nor commensurate with its use in the other. In this article it is used in the Linguistic sense. The Aryan Race means the peoples speaking the Aryan Languages. Ethnologically they are embraced in the Caucasian Race. There are two Grand Divisions

* We are indebted to the following authors: Dr. O. Schrader, Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan Race; Charles Morris, The Aryan Race; Max Müller, Biography of Words and Home of the Aryans.

—East and West Aryans. The East Aryans comprise the Hindus, Persians and Bactrians. The West Aryans comprise the Greeks, Romans, Kelts, Teutons, Slavs.

KINSHIP LOST AND DISCOVERED.

It is only within the present century that the kinship of the above nations was discovered to themselves. We read in an old sacred book how the grandson of a famous Mesopotamian emigrant traveled alone on foot from Canaan back to the home of his grandsire; how, wearied on reaching the district, he sat down by a well. A pretty lass came who captivated his heart on first sight. Inquiry led to the knowledge they were cousins. Jacob was not more astonished to find the lovely Rachel at the well his cousin than the English, after getting possession of India and investigating Sanskrit, were astonished to find the Hindus first cousins, that the ancestors of each at some time in the dim, dim antiquity, dwelt together as one tribe and spoke a common language. Further research brought to light the fact that Sanskrit, Persian, Greek, Roman, Keltic, Teutonic, Slavic are all branches from one and the same language. As a consequence, these nations are first cousins. Only distance we would suppose (and some not amicable feeling between certain of the cousins adjacent) prevented a rising and general hand-shaking over so marvelous a revelation. Long, long ago it was when the Aryan forefathers formed one community, wondrous the lot fallen to East and West Aryans and the nations of each. Nothing in Archæology, however, is more certain than their being descendants of one tribal community. Its differentiation into peoples and nations is one of history's exciting romances.

THE ARIADNE THREAD.

The History of Europe led student and investigator alike back to a prehistoric era. A dark abysm of time lay beyond the earliest records. History opened with Europe populated by Aryans. There was a broad chasm and dark between the Bible

account of a primitive dispersion at Babel, and the emergence of the Aryan Diaspora into the light of secular history. The history of the Aryans was broken, the connection with the origins of humanity lost, sunken seemingly into irrecoverable oblivion. There was no bridging the chronological abyss lying between the buttresses of Revelation on the yonder side and those of Secular History on the hither side. That was a void which imagination—the mind, like nature, abhorring a vacuum—was left to fill and by it was populated with horrid mythological creations—

“gorgons, hydras and chimeras dire.”

But inquisitive, restless man who ceaselessly assaults the polar region to wrest from that mystic zone its ice-locked secret—inquisitive man was also devising the conquest of this terra incognita of Aryan history. The problem was truly perplexing. No detective ever began ferreting out a criminal mystery with less clue. No monumental remains or hieroglyphics did these “rude forefathers of the (Aryan) hamlet leave,” such as Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt bequeathed to posterity. Archaeology, wondrous handmaid of History, stood by with pick and shovel in her hands, but stood idle and abashed. There was no work for her to do. Champollions and Smiths with magic genius for deciphering sat listless by, for no Rosetta Stone or Ashurbanipal library of Arya had they to exercise their skill. But some reminiscences the Aryan forefathers transmitted after all, strangely hid, covered over not with earth, but covered over by the language accretions of many centuries. Fragments of words it was found floated down from those far-off beginnings, roots of words. These under the cross-questioning of Comparative Philology began to divulge a wondrous tale. They told what thoughts the Aryan forefathers revolved in mind, what objects enlisted their attention, what vocabulary was then in use. From these data Philology proceeded to determine their primitive seat and state of civilization.

HOME OF THE ARYANS.

There have been great debates over this locality, reminding one of the contested birth-place of Homer. Zealous advocates have plead laboriously for districts in Europe and Asia. Formerly the table-land of Iran was conceded the preference of claim. Max Müller still considers the preponderance of probability in its favor. Schrader, however, finds the weight of probability decidedly in favor of Russia, up the valley of the Volga. The clue to the determination of the locality is the vocabulary of terms employed by the original Aryans for fauna and flora. This vocabulary is made out by an equation of the terms through the various Aryan languages,—the terms common were in use before separation. After forming the vocabulary the crucial question comes. The fauna and flora and climatic conditions of what district conform nearest to this vocabulary? As yet the answer to the question is not decisive.

STATE OF CIVILIZATION.

This the Philologist proceeded to reproduce after the same manner. We find an original Aryan term for house, then they had houses; for wagon, then they used wagons. Likewise, it was reasoned as to food, clothing, social relations, views about God and a future life. After sufficiently long research, exhausting the equation of terms through all the Aryan languages, the Philologist clapped his hands and shouted, Eureka! I have found it—that ancient Aryan civilization. Though somewhat over-sanguine as to the sufficiency of Comparative Philology to settle fully points in that civilization, his elation is nevertheless justified. Since then two other sciences have coöperated with Linguistic Paleontology—Comparative Archaeology and History. These formed a "Triple Alliance," and by these three the work of reconstructing the old Aryan civilization is jointly prosecuted, and before these three questions concerning it are adjudged. Only an index summary of this civilization is possible within our monograph.

There were three kinds of dwellings: the dug-out, the hut and the wagon. The modern Aryan, in his dug-out in Kansas and Nebraska, is a living representative in *modus vivendi* of his prehistoric ancestry. Biologists would term it a reversion of type after thousands of years. The "cow-boy," too, had his prototype in the prehistoric Aryan. The primitive Aryans were "cattle men," their wealth was in their herds. Whether there were "cattle kings," is not yet announced, but most probably there were. While using the dug-out and hut, when encamped for a goodly while, the Aryans were nomads, and lived largely in wagons, movable houses. These must not be misunderstood for the Aryan "Prairie Schooner," so ubiquitous in years of drought on the Western plains. No; it was a clumsy, log-wheeled contrivance, drawn by oxen, upon which the head of the household transported wife and children. This primitive Aryan practiced agriculture to a very limited extent. Of domestic animals, he was familiar with the cow, sheep and goat. He knew the horse; used him not for riding, but for meat and milk. He was not acquainted with the pig (we trust with advantage to his habits), nor with domestic fowl. As to clothing, these antique ancestors cannot be given high eulogy for their raiment's fine texture, its beauteous hues, or artistic make-up. It had three commendable qualities, however—simplicity, cheapness and durability. The common material was hides, though they knew woolen and linen fabrics. Socially, they had the family, the father absolute monarch, wife and children his property. The relationship was agnatic. Rich men, likely, had a plurality of wives. Adultery in the husband was lawful; in the wife, punishable with death. The bride was secured in two ways—purchase and capture—vastly different each method from the present, the reader will note. We also call attention here to what so judicious an authority as Schrader says, concerning the oft-alleged superior regard for women among the Aryans. He fails to discover its evidence. As to government of the community, it was democratic, tending to representative government, as in our Republic, over against the

patriarchal system among Semites, which tended to monarchy. Concerning the religious sentiments of the primitive Aryans, opposite views obtain among authorities. Müller and Kuhn hold Mythology is an old form of language. Nature was viewed as everywhere endowed with life, and its powers and phenomena were personified. In later times this came to be understood as fact, and not figure; hence senseless and gross myths. Those who hold that religion as well as intellect is an evolution out of animal instincts of course reject the philological explanation of mythology. Believing, as we do, that man is the product of a Divine afflatus, we cannot accept the atheistic evolutionary theory concerning the origin and earliest religion of men. As, however, the human race, except in a chosen few, everywhere turned to nature-worship, the question concerning the primitive Aryans is, whether they, in this prehistoric era, in the exercise of a lively infantile imagination, personified Nature, or in idolatrous superstition ascribed Divine attributes to Nature and rendered it worship. Schrader is of the opinion their language and cult indicate religious adoration of Nature; that the equation of religious terms, in connection with Nature-worship at the dawn of the historic era, is evidence unimpeachable that at the earliest date language brings before us, the Aryans deified and worshiped nature-powers.

DIVISIONS, MIGRATIONS, HOMES.

Having thus summarily considered their state of culture and civilization, we hasten to follow them into their future fortunes. We behold them a single tribe, on the plains of Iran or steppes of Russia, with the most rudimentary elements of civilization and tribal organization of simplest democratic form. Whence they came to this common home and how, from what stem of earlier humanity they branched, cannot be told. The date and length of their sojourn in this common home is likewise oblivion's property. We know it was in the remote past. The Hindus arrived in the Punjab 2000-1500 B. C. That was doubtless a goodly while after the original bifurcation into East

and West Aryans. This primeval Aryan tribe carried in it, let us note in passing, the germ of a great future. They had no prophet to predict to them how great they would become. But in them, though in lower sense than in the Hebrew tribe, were all nations to be blessed. They were not a spiritual priesthood, bearing the Messianic lineage and Ark of Covenant, but they bore the destiny of the world's future material civilization, mental and social culture, as the Israelite that of spiritual culture. To these rude uncivilized Aryans there also came a call which said: "Get you up out of your home, separate yourselves into many peoples and go into lands which I will show thee, and I will make each of you a great people, and powerful nations shall arise out of thee." We do not say this was an audible call, or that they were conscious of such a high Divine vocation. The impulse which set the tribe into migratory motion and separation may have been a very matter-of-fact, business affair—shortage of pasture for increasing herds, a roving impulse not explainable. But behind and through such natural agency the will and purpose of the Most High was working. So they divided in twain, turned their backs on each other, one party setting their face toward the rising, the other toward the setting sun. The Eastward-bound party remained together for a time and then subdivided. One branch turned southward, and, halting, founded Persia, which later stood at the head of a World Empire. The other branch moved southeast, and on the peninsula of Hindustan reared a marvelous civilization. The West Aryans, after remaining together a time, gradually divided into five branches. The Kelt seems to have taken the vanguard on the westward march. He forced his way to the sea and islands, "left rude but magnificent monuments to attest an architectural skill, which has never deserted them." (Fairbairn.) The remainder of the West tribe by and by broke into Northern and Southern divisions; the Northern subdivided into Teuton and Slav, the Southern into Greek and Roman. The Greek and Roman, each in his day, bore the honor and burden of a World Empire; Teuton and Slav now

divide between them the greater part of the earth. "There is something," says Fairbairn, "which strangely touches the imagination,"—we add something extremely pathetic and that strangely touches the heart—"as we see those bands of brothers, each going his own way to a near or distant, a more or less glorious destiny; each carrying a talent given him of God, which he was in time to develop for himself and humanity. They forgot their kinship, were ignorant of each other's existence. They met in later times as civilized and barbarian, as white and dark-skinned, met as deadly foemen in war's bloody fray."

Of these primeval migrations no vestige of record or monument remains save the Linguistic. No saga did the blue-eyed Norseman sing of these oldest days and pilgrimage and leave to his posterity, nor Kelt erect a cairn along the route inscribed with runes. No Mizpah stone was set up at these several leave-takings. We feel justified, however, in assuming from conditions that the marching to and entering by each into possession of his own inheritance was stern, rugged business on to the end. It was doubtless fighting more or less as they went, if not with man, then with Nature, and conquering as they took possession. Wherever they went they found peoples before them and land pre-empted. The Aryan, however, "jumped the claim," a feat his offspring after 3000 years can perform with perhaps more than ancestral agility. These Aryan tribes did not, like those of Israel, co-operate in securing each his inheritance. Each fought his way for himself. What raids, battles, slaughters, devastations obtained in this first great Aryan outflow cannot be conjectured. Perhaps in many instances the Lord sent a "hornet before them"—the terror of their name as that of the Northmen much later—which caused the Aborigines to flee or surrender. Faint reminiscences of these aborigines yet obtain in the Basques of Spain, Lapps and Finns of North Europe, Mountain Tribes of India. It is assented to that the aborigines were largely assimilated. Physical modifications of the Aryans place it

beyond doubt. It is debatable whether any specimen of the pure Aryan remains. The fair-skinned, blue-eyed Norseman must be awarded the honor, if it be awarded at all.

These migrations are denominated by Morris the Aryan's first outflow. Its aggressive momentum must have been mighty in propulsive force, long protracted. It ceased only with Neptune's realm on the West, the Ice-King's realm on the North of Europe. Nature, not man, set bounds to the Aryan conquest. When history begins, the Aryans, thus enlarged and diversified, are in possession of India, Bactria, Persia, Armenia, Caucasus, Media, Asia Minor, all Europe except fringes on the West and considerable portions on the North. Their domain extends from Farther India to the Atlantic, an unbroken line and compact arena.

HALT—CIVIL DEVELOPMENT AND CULTURE.

No enlargement of this geographical area, of any note, took place for a period of two to three thousand years. A variety of causes—natural and historical—are assigned for this halt. Physical obstacles confronted them. With the resources then at command these can be pronounced insurmountable. The Ocean on the West was unnavigable, the frozen plains and deserts on the North were formidable, with no inducement for exertion to occupy. Warlike tribes by pressure had become densely massed in South India and presented a phalanx hard to penetrate. The Semites of Syria and Assyria were foemen worthy to cope with Aryan powers and in military art excelled, so that they checked the spent waves of Aryan aggression which beat against them. These obstacles constitute sufficient cause on a natural basis for the Aryan halt. But causes have reasons behind them. Without a reason the causes for this Aryan halt would not have obtained. That reason must be sought in a Divine purpose. God set bounds to the sea. Here let thy proud waves be stayed. So to the over-rushing waves of Aryan aggression, He said: Thus far and no farther at present. He had now a different employment for the

Aryans. Hence we find them after 3000 years—A. D. 1600—occupying no wider area than at the dawn of their history. What did this halt mean? What were they doing? In the physical sphere when a body with vast momentum suddenly halts the *vis viva* is not annihilated, but transformed—motion becomes heat. So the Aryan propulsive energy was by Providence turned into a different sphere—to the acquisition and advancement of their intellectual and civil, moral and religious culture. They became settled and civilized, enlightened and refined, Christianized, striding to the van of the human column in Science, Art, Religion, Material Civilization. In short, these were their School-Days. Rather wild school boys, these Aryan tribes and nations—as Aryan boys at College even now. They fought much with each other—Persian with Greek, Greek with Roman, Roman with Teuton, and innumerable minor wars. They did not know their Aryan kinship, and it would not have made any difference if they did. These were veritable bull-dog fights, oft from mere love of fighting. Persian and Greek met at Marathon, and

"The glad earth drank their blood
On old Plateia's day."

Alexander fulminated over Greece, hurled his Macedonian phalanx with thunderbolt crash and shattered to fragments the Persian Empire. Later the Roman cohort locked in death-grapple with this phalanx—children of fathers who once stood shoulder to shoulder defending a common tribe. Rome continued sending her eagle-standards, borne victorious by stalwart legions, East and West, gathering Kelt, Teuton, Greek, Persian under its wings. Goth, Vandal and kindred Teutons poured a devastating flood over the Empire. Fierce and sanguinary were wars by Norsemen, Frank, Saxon, Slav. They fought also with Semite neighbors. One would infer there was little study amid such incessant pugilism. It must be said, however, they were good students in those days. Their wars were only diversion, prankish school-boy freaks, outbreaks of pent-up

physical energy (and perhaps diabolism) that could find no rational outlet. They were not diverted from the serious work of study—they gathered up the elements of Turanian and Semitic Culture and Civilization, and then set themselves to advancing it by original contributions. The Greek genius developed Mental Science and Art, the Roman genius developed Civil Polity and Jurisprudence. The Teuton came later. At first his boorish barbarism threatened to play the role of bull in china-shop with the magnificent Græco-Roman Civilization. Nevertheless after a thousand years his cranium had fully appropriated their culture, and with sturdy, energetic vigor of mind and body, sanctified by the renewing power of Christianity, he in turn took the van of Humanity's column and has led it with masterly enterprise and heroism far on toward the millennium. But before taking up the results of the Aryan School-Day period in partial detail we will cast a glance at vacillating contests waged with Semitic and Turanian Races, restriction of territorial area and the second great Aryan outflow or extension.

ARYAN VS. SEMITE AND TURANIAN.

The first aggression of Aryan upon Semitic domain in the historic era was by Cyrus the Great, at the head of Medes and Persians. This Aryan captain conquered Babylon and enlarged the Aryan domain with her territory. The Romans extended Aryan limits over North Africa. But with the empire's fall and decadence of civilization under Teutonic onslaught Aryan territory suffered an alarming reduction. The Huns (378), a Turanian tribe, drove the Goths before them, and paired off what is now Slavonic Europe. They penetrated even to Gaul and Italy, and at Soissons fought one of the decisive battles of history—decisive whether Aryans or Turanians should be masters of Europe. Hungary was left as a permanent footprint of their irruption. This was one of the satanic spewings as a river by which the serpent sought to sweep the sun-woman from the earth (Rev. 12: 15). In the Churches of Italy the Litany arose, "Save us, O God, and deliver us from the

Huns." Next the Arabians, a Semitic people, had a colossal ground-swell in Mohammedanism (640-700). It rolled along resistless and overwhelming, drove Aryans from Syria and North Africa, brought Persia and Spain under Semitic domain. Another Turanian onset under Genghis Khan (1218), slashed off India and a great part of Russia from Arya. Lastly the Turks (1450), another Turanian tribe and also part of Islam, supplanted Semitic rule in Persia, Syria, Asia Minor, Armenia, captured Eastern Europe and the islands of the Mediterranean.

With this posture of the races, the middle ages of Europe closed. It is needless to remark that this was a dark season for Arya. Her geographical area was reduced one-half. It seemed as though the Aryans had spent their day and played their part on the world-stage and were destined to retire. Many were ready to exclaim, *Ichabod*. A mighty contraction of territory had befallen them, many of Arya's children were sighing under a foreign yoke. As the darkening shadows kept closing in upon her and the pall became darker and denser it seemed as though for Arya the endless night had come. But it was not so; this was not night, but an eclipse. Her children, like Israel's in Babylon, would be ransomed from their captivity. No Great Unknown like the II. Isaiah was there, however, for Arya, to speak high words of cheer and answer the cry, "Watchman, what of the night?" with soul-comforting message, "The morning cometh." But the morning came, and she was glad.

In the counsels of eternity, God proposed another era of expansion for the Aryan race. A call came to Arya which said, "Enlarge the place of thy tent and let them stretch forth the curtains of thy habitations. Spare not, lengthen thy cords and strengthen thy stakes, for thou shalt spread abroad on the right hand and on the left." So Arya arose at God's summons, and empowered with God's might went forth a second time conquering and to conquer, invincible and irresistible. An era of expansion began with modern times which has rolled on and on and reached its climax in our day by encircling the globe, land and sea. This expansive movement had one point of beginning

in Spain, where surviving Aryans set about recovering their peninsula by expelling the Arab Moors. They persevered until the "last sigh of the Moor" was heaved as he bade a reluctant farewell to the land of silver mist and golden grain. Coincident with the revival of Aryan aggression in Spain, the Papacy, as the head of Aryan Europe, which was now the staunch defender of the Cross, roused the nations to a herculean effort to wrest the Holy Land from infidel hands. The geographical gain here, however, was small, and even that temporary; but it served a purpose as a general muster of Arya under the banner of the Cross. An Aryan Christendom now stood against the Crescent and felt stirred to conquest of the world for Christ. In another corner of Europe, Russia began re-asserting with force her right to that original Aryan domain. With the sturdy strength of the northern bear she kept pushing the Turk back and back, and ere this would have pushed him out of Europe had not jealousy of Aryan nations interfered. Hungary was in part colonized again by Aryans, and the Magyars are fully assimilated into Arya and Christianity. The Aryans of India, reinforced by the Anglo-Saxon race, reclaimed that peninsula from Semite control. So a goodly part of the territory lost to Semite and Turanian is again Aryan possession.

The second Aryan outflow, however, consists not chiefly in the recovery of lost ground. The attention of the Aryans was directed by Providence to another quarter of the globe, and there its main expansion took place. An Aryan sea-captain, near the end of the fifteenth century, dreamed a beautiful day-dream. The time had come he thought for Aryans to disregard Neptune's imperial mandate which halted his forefathers 2000 years previously on the Atlantic shore. The time he thought had arrived to annex this sea to Arya's domain and solve the mystery of the western flood. The murmur of the waves breaking on the shores of Western Europe whispered secrets to his ear. Mystic voices coming from far called him to enter the veil and solve the mystery shrouding these vast waters. He ventured forth into the veiled realm, and *mirabile visu!* He found a new world

ensconced in the ocean's broad breast. Saul set out to find his father's asses and found a kingdom instead. Columbus set out to find a route to India and found a hemisphere. This new world the Aryans at once claimed. European nations rushed across the Atlantic and into it pell-mell, *a la mode* later Aryans on Oklahoma and Cherokee strip. The Western Continent became Aryan domain.

This with other possessions in Europe and Asia might seem sufficient for one race. But after appropriating this fully in 400 years his whetted appetite led the Aryan to look around for new expansive enterprise. The sea was his because he first sailed the great deep. Then of course the islands in it were his also—some of them, as Australia and Borneo, no insignificant patches for farming and pasturage. Surely this ought to suffice. The commercial fraternity thought Northern Africa needed better governmental supervision. Who could do it so well as the Aryan? He told the impudent and incompetent Turk to leave and assumed charge de affaires: England took Egypt, France and Spain looked after the remainder of the Mediterranean coast. The Russian looked after Northern Asia, and gradually the Slav extended his possessions to the Pacific. The same Aryan agent served quit notice on the Turk in Bulgaria; Servia and the Balkan State are under Aryan control. Looking over the globe the Aryans saw real estate was becoming scarce in the market. The only people who had any to dispose of were the Africans. The Aryan had previously invested in some out-lying lots of Africa, the Mediterranean shore, the west coast, the southern projection. These investments led to desire for more. So, calling a meeting of the European Branch of the Aryan Real Estate Board, it was decided useless to purchase in small lots—they would as a Board buy the entire African farm and afterwards divide it among themselves. This colossal real estate transaction is only recent. So Africa has passed under the control of the Aryans. They have control therefore of Europe, the two Americas, Africa, the Islands of the Sea and the Sea itself, with a large share in Asia: India, Siberia,

Burmah, Cochin China. This is the second expansive cycle, following the prehistoric. We lack the gift of prophecy and will not venture any predictions as to whether the maximum is now reached. But the Aryan type of civilization seems destined for the whole family of man. All people are either the wards or voluntary pupils of the Aryans. From their hands they learn science, arts, material inventions, and, highest of all, the true religion.

ARYAN CULTURE.

The Aryans have many points of superior excellence beside that of territorial aggrandizement. Were they nothing more than Land-Grabbers, who in the competition for earthly possessions deftly outwitted or ruffianly bullied their neighbors, and took possession, we would not rehearse this story. But the Aryans excel in all that pertains to progress toward the goal of human history, and in all that pertains to the solution of humanity's problems. In Art, Science, Literature, Philosophy, Material Industries, Spiritual Culture, the Aryan Race are as far in advance as in Real Estate accumulation. We referred to a long period (2000 to 3000 years) when Aryan aggressiveness for territorial extension slumbered. Those years as mentioned were fruitful in civil, intellectual and spiritual culture. They were taking lessons from abroad wherever instruction could be secured. They were apt learners, soon were wiser than all their teachers. They became largely a self-taught, or more properly a God-taught people. The Light of the World it was, the Logos, who illuminated the intellect of Philosopher, Artist, Poet. Intellectually the Aryans rank highest in mankind, catching the rudimentary germs from others, they developed the rudiments into magnificent systems.

LITERATURE.

Take Literature, the expression of sublimest, grandest, most beautiful thoughts in most exquisite diction, such a literature as is now largely the mental alimentation of enlightened nations, luxurious and rich as the fabled ambrosia of the gods—a litera-

ture into which the True, the Beautiful, the Good, from the entire domain of thought, are gathered like a storehouse of gems from mines of Golconda, and presented in a setting that realizes the proverb: Apples of gold in baskets of silver;—where is that found? There is but little in the Classic department outside the Aryan Race. What is termed Literature in ancient Babylonia and Egypt is so termed for accommodation's sake. And so of China. Scholars who have examined these report them far below the Classic standard. The excerpts given us are sufficient demonstration. Antiquarian interest lends them value. They are the juvenile and youthful efforts of the human mind. One literary work and one alone in Semitic and Turanian touches the Aryan level—the Oracles of God in Hebrew. These holy seers spoke borne along by the Holy Spirit. The Israelites retain the unique honor of giving to the world a volume which forever retains the peerless title: *The Book* (*ὁ Βιβλος*). But leaving out that when we inquire for a Plato, Homer, Eschylus, Virgil, Demosthenes, Cicero, Shakespeare, Goethe, Milton, stars of the first magnitude in the literary world, with an innumerable host of secondary stars stellated about them, poets, historians, essayists, in Greek, Roman, English, German, French, Italian;—we ask for them in vain outside the Aryans. Aryan minds conceived the thoughts that breathe, Aryan lips framed and uttered the burning words which constitute the glory of the human intellect in Literature. In their Classics alone is found the full apocalypse of the soul's passions. The Muse of Literature had her home among the Aryans.

ART.

Pass along to the realm of Art, of Beauty, where the imagination and artistic skill of man come into miniature rivalry with God's artistic handiwork as He molded created matter into gainly forms and clothed with goodly adorning. Ask where are artists who, dipping pencil in colors, have on canvas reproduced God's glories of firmament and landscape, of rose and human face divine? Where artists whose plastic skill with hammer and

chisel on cold marble vied with Divine handiwork in realizing the human form, or with hands on harp have gathered up the harmonies of creation and poured them forth in floods of symphony that ravish mind and heart? Where in Architecture—termed frozen Music—has obtained the creative imagination that reared fane and palace resembling in perspective cloudland domes and starry vistas, drawing travelers from distant lands and riveting admiring gaze from multitudes, awing infidel into adoration? Where were those Bards, who touched their harp and nations heard entranced, whose sublime melodies roll on undying down the ages? Apelles, Phidias, Angelo, Dante, Beethoven, Handel, Wagner, Tennyson—all are Aryans. Music is a modern Art and is all Aryan copyright. In the Arts other Races never passed beyond the rude, vast, grotesque. Art made her home with the Aryans.

SCIENCE.

"The world of science," says Morris, "is almost entirely an Aryan world. True, contributions have been made to Science from Semitic sources, as the Babylonian Calendar, Arabic Science in the Middle Ages. The Mongolians of China have also Mathematics independently. But if we ask Natural Science whose coffers now are full to overflowing and which, like the Rich Man, must pull down her storehouses and build larger—ask her: What people brought you these treasures? Her answer will be—the Aryans. Ask Zoölogy—Who marshalled the whole animal creation in their ranks of orders, families, genera, species and gave them names—who put into the hands of mankind a transcript of the classification in the Divine plan as to the Animal Kingdom? Zoölogy will point her finger to Aristotle, Cuvier, Agazziz, Darwin—all Aryans. Ask Botany: Who arranged the Vegetable Kingdom into a beautiful parterre, came forth from private conference in the secret counsel chamber of the Almighty with an authentic transcript of His ideal classification of the Plant World? Botany will point her finger to Linnæus, Brown, Candolla, Gray—all

Aryans. Ask Astronomy: Who has been the Columbus of the Heavens, gone out into the blue deeps of infinite space and there discovered not one world, but millions and millions? Who has thought God's thoughts after Him as expressed in the system and laws of the universe? Astronomy will point her finger to Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, Newton, Herschel—all Aryans. Ask Geology: Who has taken this material globe as a mystic scroll rolled together, its strata written on within and without, sealed that no one could open, and has prevailed to open—by Divine illumination of intellect then read therefrom the Story of Creation in God's own handwriting—a story collateral to and corroborative of that in the Hebrew Oracles? Geology will point her finger to Lyell, Hugh Miller, Murchison, Hitchcock—all Aryans. In short, the Aryans are the acknowledged teachers of mankind in Natural Science.

INVENTIVE GENIUS.

Pass on to inventive genius in human nature, the wondrous talisman whose feats of reality far surpass imagination's dreams in Arabian Nights—the genius which is Aladdin's lamp and magic ring, etc., all in one—where has that genius flowered and fruited? To whom was the key into Nature's arcana donated, secrets that revolutionized the relations of man to Nature, that raised him from a cowering subject to a triumphant lord, whose high behests she implicitly obeys? Again the answer is, To the Aryans. The genius that invented steamship and locomotive, captured and tamed the lightning, making it errand-boy and draft-horse, that called into being and service Printing Press scattering leaves of knowledge like leaves of autumn, Telegraph and Telephone enabling antipodes to whisper as though mouth was placed to ear; the genius that harnesses elements and rides in kingly palaces across continents and seas in few days, that rears colossal factories and has them weave his fabrics and manufacture his implements; that in brief made the earth a "new earth" for man to live on—that genius is an Aryan possession.

CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION.

The greatest glory of the Aryans, however, is not their becoming civil rulers of the nations, nor commercial activity, nor Science, Art, Inventions and Material Industries. Their greatest glory and highest mission is their becoming the standard-bearers of the Cross, the propagators of our Holy Christian faith—the Religion of the Son of God. When the Eternal Son, through whom all things were created, in whom all things consist, became incarnate for us men and our salvation, finished the work of our Redemption and ascended to the right hand of the Majesty on High—when He asked of men—Who will become the heralds of the Glad Tidings, carry to conquest and victory the Cross as the standard of the Kingdom of Heaven upon earth?—the Semite Jew answered with a heavy curse—“Not I.” The Græco-Roman Aryan, standing at a distance, but hearing the summons, answered—“Here am I, send me.” He was sent and he went. The Græco-Roman bore the Cross first to victory of the World Empire. Next the Teutonic Aryans became the stout and stalwart heroes of the Cross. They are now carrying the name of Jesus and the salvation in that Name to earth’s remotest bounds and to every kindred tribe and tongue. It is through their agency

The morning light is breaking,
The darkness disappears,
The sons of earth are waking,
To penitential tears,

in long benighted lands. Christian Civilization through their energetic aggressiveness is brought to every people—indeed is forced upon them *nolens volens*. The Aryan chose the kingdom of heaven first and all the blessings of World-civilization have become his likewise. As the King of Glory looks upon the earth and sees the Aryans vigorously pressing the conquest of Nature, bringing her powers into servitude, peering into her mysteries—while He blesses them in this and in spreading Civil

Liberty and Constitutional Government, we feel confident no department of Aryan enterprise is to Him so dear as that of carrying the Gospel into the realms of darkness and spiritual death—that Gospel which sheds heavenly benedictions on life here and casts radiance of hope on life hereafter. And while confident that it is He who anoints Aryan Statesmen, Scientists and Inventors with the manifold gifts of the Spirit and blesses their several missions, we feel assured on no Aryan contingent does He gaze with such benignant countenance as on the Ten Thousand Missionaries who are following His own footsteps in ministering to the bodies and souls of men. The greatest achievement of the Aryans is not their developing and gathering the treasures, riches and glory of earth, but their bringing these into the New Jerusalem and laying them at the feet of Him who is King of kings and Lord of lords. The crowning glory of the Aryans is that of superintending and leading the races of mankind as they are bringing forth the royal diadem and crowning Jesus Lord of all. When this is done they will receive the commendation—"Well done, good and faithful servant, enter into the joy of thy Lord."

VI.

MODERNIZING CHRISTIANITY.

BY REV. MAURICE G. HANSEN.

THE first of the two words of this title is not, as the grammarians say, a participial adjective, but the present participle of the active transitive verb to modernize, and it implies an agent or agents. The second is not meant simply to distinguish the religion of which the Lord Jesus is the Founder from those that bear the names of Mohammed and Buddha, but as designating the teaching, the management, the worship, and the requirements of the first, upon the basis of the instructions of the whole Bible, and as represented by the association of which Christ is the Head. The two words together describe the topic we propose to consider to be the attempt to set forth the doctrines of the Christian religion in accordance with the form of thought and its expression in vogue at present; to adapt the cultus of the Christian Church to the customs and usages of the age; to conduct the government of the Church upon the principle of the broad, so-called prudence and expedience of the day; and to adjust the rules of conduct enjoined upon His followers by Christ and exemplified by Him in His walk among men, and by prophets and apostles, in conformity with the spirit of the times which boasts of progress, liberality and humanitarianism.

It must be admitted that there are certain circumstances which need only be mentioned unto the recognition of them as solid arguments in support of the statement that the modernizing of Christianity, when of the right kind, might even be viewed as an imperative duty the evasion of which by the

Church of Christ brings upon her the burden of great guilt. For what is the perpetual obligation upon the Church if it be not that, according to the command of the Lord Jesus, she "go into all the world and proclaim the Gospel to every creature"? The obligation unto this proclamation is, in the language of the mathematician, an invariable quantity, and it bears without limitation as to time. Hence, not only is the Church not to cease bringing the gospel to every creature, but she is also to make it accessible to every creature. This is done in one way by presenting the Gospel to the people to which she brings it, in that people's vernacular. She would not meet her responsibility by taking the Bible to the inhabitants of darkest Africa in the form it is in the Hebrew Scripture, the Septuagint, the Vulgate, and the Greek New Testament. She must make it accessible to them by offering it to them in their own speech. St. Paul uses this reasoning in the Epistle to the Corinthians: "Even things without life giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped? . . . Except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken, for ye shall speak into the air . . . If I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me. . . . If I pray in an unknown tongue my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful. What is it then? I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also. . . Else when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?" The propriety, nay, the wisdom of this in reference to its application to the matter of rendering the Holy Scriptures into the various dialects of the earth, is readily admitted; but, should it not be recognized also in the matter of presenting the thoughts of the Bible, when clothed in a particular dialect, in such a manner that they may become accessible to the minds of the people using that dialect, and at the period in that people's history

when such proclamation of Bible-thoughts is made to it? It is a well-known experience of missionaries that frequently, when seeking to preach to a certain nation in that nation's vernacular, they suddenly discover that there is no term therein that is adapted to express a particular Bible-thought. What do they? They make that thought accessible to their hearers by paraphrasing it in *their* language by means of conceptions which conform to their mode of thinking and their mental peculiarities. In so far the missionary modernizes Christianity, or the system of gospel-teaching which is, as before stated, a part of that which the term Christianity designates.

The same argument that justifies the translation of the Bible into every known tongue on the face of the earth, and also a certain circumlocution in the presentation of its contents whenever the circumstance of a defective vernacular demands it, so that the Word of God may find its way to the intellect, the conscience, and the heart of the hearer, may be advanced in support of a revision of a translation in a time when much progress has been made in the critical study of the languages in which Holy Scripture originally was given to man; and also the adoption of the manner of setting forth the truth that shall prove most successful in reaching the understanding and the emotions in an age when, as the result of the progress of the human race in civilization, of the natural development of humanity, and of the immense advance constantly making in the sciences, not only are the local habitations of millions different from those of the peoples among which the Bible had its origin, but the environments and conditions of life of millions are wholly diverse; each of these two facts modifying, to a larger degree than can be conceived, the intellectual and the emotional idiosyncrasies of the multitude, even though they are in themselves realities which may be viewed as, to use once more a phraseology borrowed from the algebraist, variable quantities. A preacher cannot afford to ignore what in the course of centuries appears under changing aspects if he would bring home the Word of the Lord most closely to those whose mental attitudes

and feelings are shaped by the conditions of life in the locality and in the age in which Providence has cast their lot. Should not preachers be permitted, nay, may they not sometimes feel impelled, by the application of Wisdom from above, to modernize the presentation of Bible-truth, in so far that they offer, with the Bible-language in which it is set forth, appropriate illustrations and paraphrases, while they carefully avoid all injudicious and presumptuous substitutions for it? Upon the recognition of that which renders such an inquiry most pertinent, the claim, arising from the disposition of having Christianity as broadly available as the condition of the human need of its instructions is a universal one, was made in Central Europe during the middle of the eighteenth century, to the effect that, where absolutely necessary for the clearer apprehension of their true meaning, the teachings of the Bible might be lifted, for western hearers, from their Oriental vestments, and thus for them be placed upon the ground of a broader humanity. A claim of this kind was made by such men as Lavater, the eminent physiognomist, theologian, preacher and hymnologist. Acting upon it, in the attempt to put European thought-form in an Eastern dress, he published a number of proverbs as the Lord Jesus Christ might possibly have spoken them. The Swiss Pfenninger also, in the same direction, wrote a Christian romance, entitled *Jewish Letters*, in which he made the men and women, of the time of the Lord Jesus, write letters to each other, in a strain similar to that which characterized the correspondence of sentimental people of his own age and country. The aim of these authors was to educate the readers of their works up to the ability to discern, from the standpoint of a Western continent and a modern age, Bible-truth intended for all men, in all times, and in all places, though clothed in language peculiar to the East, or even cast in an Oriental outline of form.

Since the word Christianity, in its wider signification, covers also the idea of the cult of the Church of Christ, the inquiry: Whether a call for its modernization can arise, and, if so, whether it may be heeded?—is not out of place here. That

the forms of worship, the outward instruments by means of which it is conducted, the visible and audible vehicles, or expressions of it, also are variable quantities, lies at the foundation of some of the distinctions between the sects into which Christendom is divided. If they be in their nature variable, may they not be varied to suit locality, time and circumstances, so long as the spirit of worship be not absent, and the particular form of cult selected for its expression, do not weaken or fetter that spirit, nay, on the contrary, enlarge devotion and impart to it a greater soaring power? The Church of Christ of this age worships her Head and Redeemer under conditions vastly different from those which existed when only one century had passed away since her Master's return heavenward. And even in this same age what a difference between the environment and circumstances of the part of the Church established in tropical countries, and those of the part which is located under the Arctic zone! Is not a modernization of the cult of the Church, to suit a peculiar condition of things, sometimes a necessity? If the use of clerical vestments instead of the merely secular garb for pastors while performing their official duties; that of a pool in the pulpit-platform instead of the living, flowing natural stream; that of the organ's solemn peal to aid and to guide the human voice in songs of praise; that of bread in the form of a wafer instead of that of irregularly broken fragments; that of individual communion-cups instead of the single chalice from which all partake,—the use of these several things, and of many others, for those employed in former times, or in other countries, or in different circumstances, and all these that have been alluded to, mentioned simply in the way of illustration, not in the way, either of endorsement, or of deprecation, are more helpful to, and promoting church-worship, it would seem as though there possibly might be a plea in behalf of the right kind of innovation upon previous usages, and a modernizing of Christianity within the proper limits. *Within the proper limits.* These words are emphatic. They express in what exists the effective protection against the conversion of that which so far

has been suggested in favor of a modernizing process, into an enormous and a most deplorable evil. The peril lies in the excess. There is a line which the modernizing spirit must not cross. There is a restriction upon it which it must not presume to ignore.

There are two things which should confine the efforts at modernization within the bounds of propriety, even when these efforts are made for a laudable purpose. These are, first, the directing authority of God's Word in reference to everything embraced under the title Christianity, upon which it makes explicit utterance; second, the ever-binding requirement of the law of Christian expedience in reference to those matters which, though highly important in their very connection with Christianity, yet belong to the non-essentials. And, indeed, how could the modernization of Christianity possibly reach its avowed aim of rendering the Christian religion accessible to the understanding and the emotions of the whole human race, for the amelioration of its condition and its future redemption, if the Word of God, stable and unchangeable as the hills, and the imperative demand of a Christian expedience, were not allowed a due guiding and restraining force? Instead of success attending such an experiment as that, the completeness of the failure would testify to its utter folly. If the modernization of Christianity within proper limits be the swing of the pendulum in one direction, the transgression over these limits in the rejection of the two indispensable things just mentioned, would be the swing of the pendulum in the opposite direction with such violence as to break the connection. The controlling and balancing weight having fallen away, the entire machinery of the time-piece is unhinged and thrown into confusion. Not to speak of the modernization of Christianity which, in the view of such men as C. F. Barhdt, seeks to imprint upon Christianity the stamp of commonness, nor of the frivolous illumination which is closely akin to a bald rationalism, nor of the antinomianism which, ever ready with the cry, "The blood and the Spirit of Christ!" casts aside His precepts and example,

illustrations of the excesses that do harm, connected with the interpretation of Scripture, the government of the Church, the cult of it, and the conduct required of every one who stands professedly related to it, are furnished by many who really wish, or think they wish, to make Christianity accessible to the greatest number of people.

The word Christianity designates not only the system of doctrine of the Christian religion, but also the promulgation of Christian truths by those who are qualified for, and separated unto, this. The promulgation is by means both of the printed page and the oral teaching, the former being an aid unto the preparation for the latter. The demand of the times in respect to any kind of instruction is, liveness, attractiveness, takingness. The method of the communication of Christian knowledge through books takes on that hue, but at the expense of the soberness and the dignity that should characterize it. In a much-praised Biblical commentary which recently appeared, the "Theme" of the passage in Jer. 11: 14 is said to be, "The *prayer* of meditation silenced by God." The third of the five "scattered illustrations" adduced is, "The Christian allied with the Forces of the Universe." This proposition is thus illustrated: "When the brave Arnaud and his little band of Vaudois peasants were in despair of escaping unseen from the ruined entrenchments of Balsille to the ridge of Guignonvert, a cloud of mist came rolling down the valley, so that, enveloped in its sable curtain, they were enabled to descend undiscovered by the foe who, at dawn of day, when the fogs rolled off, were astonished to see their *prey* (*sic*) perched like the eagle beyond their reach." The pun is apparent. With what gusto it would be received by the audience to which it is dealt out second-hand, and which, attributing it to the wit of the preacher who was tempted to borrow it, would be educated by a frequent exhibition of such cunning play on words, to desire and to look for more of a similar character from one who shows he has the cleverness to be thoroughly in accord with the times in his pulpit ministrations. He, on his side, encouraged by the plaudits

of his people so cheaply earned, will not allow his modernizing—let us grant that it is well meant—to stop at this; but, besides suiting his “themes,” or “subjects,” to suit all seasons, places, and occasions, which (well advertised) he will handle in “preludes,” if not in the principal discourse; so that there is nothing that is the talk of the day and the filling-up of the newspapers that he will not “preach” about on Sunday, will lug into the pulpit a great many things which are out of place there, from the clouds in the skies to bicycles on the earth. And this is modernizing Christian preaching with a vengeance! A minister once preached a powerful sermon on “the folly, the danger, the guilt of unbelief.” “How did you like him?” was asked of one of the hearers by his friend, who that morning had been absent from church. “O, very well,” was answered in a dubious tone of voice and with a shrug of the shoulders, “but he preached such an old-fashioned sermon.” *Old-fashioned* indeed, in a time when “the ethics of bicycling” was the topic of a discourse delivered on the Lord’s Day, in the house of the Lord, by a preacher who had one of these instruments of locomotion on either side of him in the pulpit, and another suspended from the ceiling over the heads of the modernized worshipers who—how surprising—“were not arrayed in their cycling uniforms.” *Old-fashioned* indeed, in an epoch when solos, and duets, and choral performances, in “a service of song” crowd hard up to, and squeeze flatter between them, the little apology of a sermonette which, for decency’s sake, also has a place assigned it in the programme which was arranged with the object of securing a better attendance of Christian worshipers at the second service.

How fares it in this age with the ministry, the body of official heralds of the message of salvation? Is it, too, subjected to the modernizing process? It would seem that, according to modern thought and opinion, the pastorate, no matter how able, devoted and conscientious the incumbent—fails in rendering the Gospel accessible to, and accepted by, the greatest number, until it has been eked out by the periodical visitation of itiner-

ant evangelists, some of whom (not all, for there are commendable exceptions) need utter only one harangue in order to be convicted at once of vain conceit, ignorance and indiscretion. And what do the modernized Christian churches chiefly look for in those to whom they will commit the leadership over them? Learning, wisdom, experience, a record for industry, faithfulness and consecration? No, but for that, and only that, which, in the very nature of the case, cannot possibly include in the instance of even the most promising person, all, or any one of these—untried, untested, undeveloped youth. The modernized army of the Lord wishes to be officered by subalterns. Away with the captains whose scars betoken many a fierce battle, and many a hard-won field! Their gray locks indicate their total unfitness to conduct the youthful battalions on to victories for Christ. Retire them. The expression that rhymes with these words is, "fire them." O! the sometimes great expressiveness of slang. A marketman, being asked, "I have not seen your head-clerk in several days; what has become of him?" replied "We fired him, sir." In blank amazement, "Fired him,—what is that?" "Yes, sir, dismissed him, told him to go." In the armies of the world the veterans are placed in the front. Under the regime of modern Christianity the boys and girls of the Church are in the van; the elders are consigned to the rear with the baggage. "The dear young people"—what do they know, what can they do, in the exalted places into which they are thrust as often, perhaps, as they of their own accord enter them. The little King of Spain has a regiment of boy-soldiers. The officers of the regiment ride on full-grown horses. What an amusing sight to the spectator, which he can richly enjoy without any alloy of sadness. But what if it were seriously intended to send such a regiment into the heat of battle, to contend with disciplined warriors, and to keep ignominiously in the rear, men seasoned in a hundred conflicts? In that case the spectator's sadness, to which he must not venture to give utterance lest he be charged with an absurd attempt to stem the rapids of Niagara, would wholly extinguish his sense of the ludicrous.

The modernization of Christianity is seen also in the increasing laxity of administration of the government of the Church, in respect to the exercise of its discipline, whether for the rebuking of deviation in doctrine, or of obliquity of conduct. The times demand a ready use of the keys in opening the doors of the Church to applicants for admission to its privileges; but they resent even a very sparing use of them for the exclusion of those who prove themselves wholly unworthy of such benefits, either by their neglect of them, or by casting shame upon them. "Stir not up a hornet's nest." "The easiest way is the best way." "By all means let there be peace." "If you begin with one member of the Church, you may keep on with all, for they are all alike." These are the protests against every effort at purification, and they are yielded to until discipline has almost wholly disappeared from the Christian church in these days of a boasted charity, and of a broad, worldly-wise prudence. According to epitaphic testimony no wicked people die; and, according to the inference that may be drawn from the appearance of the official statistical tables of the Church, with their columns duly superscribed "suspended," ecclesiastical organizations are wholly free from the association with them of the erring, for, with exceptions exceedingly rare, these columns are in their blankness as beautifully white as the driven snow. The almost total lack of discipline that characterizes modernized Christianity, is the natural outcome of a modernization of Christianity in respect to the advocacy of perverse ideas concerning the conduct which Christianity, not modernized, enjoins upon those who profess it. This is an age of "enlightened progress." Nothing more clearly illustrates the nature of this claim than the license of behavior which it allows the declared followers of the Lord Jesus, and the fallacies with which it supports its position. "The essence of a genuine Christianity, sir, is humanitarianism. Christ makes his people free. He does not impose upon them an irksome bondage. He removes the galling restraints of legalism. Even St. Paul says, 'I am made all things to all men that I might

by all means save some.' That is just what we are after. Let us use the world, redeeming the time. Do not draw the line between the world and the Church so sharply that the latter should not have a chance to influence the former for its own good. Why, sir, this drawing sharp lines, religiously, in this age of advancement in every direction, socially, educationally, scientifically, politically, is simply impossible, and indicates considerable mental narrowness, approaching imbecility. We should be broad in our views. We should make the religion of Jesus attractive. He Himself went about eating and drinking. We should not repress a little innocent amusement between the upper and nether millstones of a strict pietism. Youth is the bright period of life, and why fill it with gloomy religious shadows? Let the young people of the Church, if they choose, dance, play cards, and attend theatres, with their companions who do not profess religion, and they will probably induce them to consent to have *their* names also enrolled upon the Church register during the revival which we propose to get up next winter. And what, I ask you, is our Christian liberty worth, if the Sabbath is really to be kept with Puritanical rigor? As for the spirit of the religion of Jesus pervading transactions in the business relations of life—that was very good in another age, and under different circumstances, but now—well, you do not think it would be advisable, even for the sake of the Christian cause, to allow those who are not professors of religion to get the idea that they who are, are not shrewd, and wide-awake, and up to the times in the ways necessary for turning 'an honest penny?'" Who is he who argues so plausibly? It is Mr. Mephistopheles, Modernizing Christian. In the show window of a tobacconist's shop, in one of the principal streets of a certain city, may be seen a wooden figure which, in that case, is not in the shape of an American Indian brandishing a tomahawk, but in that of a gentleman arrayed in the costume of a dude of a hundred years ago. The builder of the statue so faithfully reproduced in the features and the expression of the countenance Goethe's conception of the character of His Satanic

Majesty, that the observer, having perceived the short horns projecting from the forehead, made a closer inspection of the image, for the purpose of ascertaining whether it was possessed also of a tail. Indeed, the tail was there too, but so artfully concealed as to be almost invisible. That effigy would answer for the representation of a modernizing Christian of the Mephistopheles kind.

As upon the manner of setting forth Biblical truths in public service, or by means of print, upon the exercise of discipline in the Church, and upon the interpretations offered of the obligations upon those who profess the Christian religion to act in harmony with its tenets, modernizing Christianity casts an influence, a most perilous one, because it leads to the introduction of corrupting and destructive innovations, so it does the same upon the form of the cultus of the Church, especially as regards the expression of its devotion in music, with the result that, notwithstanding the avowal of the intention to worship, the spirit of it is fettered and stifled. To the correct taste of even Goethe the confusion of the sacred and the profane was repulsive. "A music," he says in his *Wilhelm Meister's Pilgrimage*, "which mixes sacred and profane character, is ungodly; and also a half-show music, which takes pleasure in expressing weak, miserable and pitiable inventions. It is insipid, for it is not serious enough to be sacred." Does not this apply, to a considerable extent, to much of the church music of the day, words and melody both? Not to speak of the secular character of many organ-selections serving for preludes, interludes, and the recitals celebrating the close of the worship; nor of the singularity of many phrases occurring now and then, when least expected, in otherwise grave and suitable hymns; what astonishing illustrations of the insipidity, and even profanity, of which Goethe complained, are furnished by the often strangely named books of so-called devotional songs, offered to, and in some instances actually used by, Sabbath-schools. The fanciful style of church-architecture, according to which the Lord's house is made to resemble, as

nearly as possible, the Queen Anne cottage of a parvenu, and what some call "the ginger-bread style of church decoration," with its blue and silver, and gold and red, have their origin in, and indicate the same spirit of a modernized Christianity which produces the weak, silly, maudlin, and sometimes incomprehensible doggerel which is dubbed a hymn, and the—what *shall* we call it?—tune to which it was set. Compare

"O golden hereafter
Whose every bright rafter," etc.,

with the grandly flowing verse of the seven great hymns of the mediæval Church not modernized: "The Celestial Country," by Bernard de Morlas; the "Dies Iræ," by Thomas de Celano; the "Stabat Mater," by Jacobus de Benedictis; the "Veni Sancti Spiritus," by King Robert II. of France; the "Veni Creator Spiritus," by the Emperor Charlemagne; the "Vexilla Regis," by Venantius Fortunatus; and the "Alleluistic Sequence," by Godescalcus. Compare, too, the frivolous or monotonous, melodies (?) used, in these days, for the music of some really fine, devotional hymns, with the magnificent chorals, like Luther's compositions which, in vast cathedrals, or in humbler Bethels, resound in swelling and rolling waves of majestic and imposing harmony.

That which in connection with this part of our discussion is beyond all to be deprecated, is the undue familiarity taken with "the Name that is above every name." The evil has grown to a proportion that, in the judgment of very many well-meaning people, the degree of spirituality that characterizes any one person, or that is thought to pertain to public religious exercises, or that is recognized in any hymn written, printed, recited, or sung; or that is predicated of any religious address, is measured by the extent to which a frequent and unconstrained use is made of the Name of the "King of kings and Lord of lords," in the way of invocation, or the application to Him of terms of endearment, or the expression toward Him of a passion to which a mother might give utterance when fondling a babe. The before-mentioned C. F. Barhdht sneeringly remarked: "One needs now to sound the name of Jesus very

often à la Lavater, to convince the great crowd that the speaker is teaching true Christianity. Therefore, I did that which prudence dictated, and delivered a real Christian sermon—that is, a sermon full of Christ.” That bold and utterly unworthy modernizer of Christianity meant that he employed in exclamation, and rang the changes upon, the Name of the blessed Anointed with the frequency and the familiarity which the unreflecting mistook for a large piety. In what did this error of the modernizing age, so destructive of all reverence and holy awe, originate? It certainly is not supported by the examples of Bible-prayers, Bible-mention of the incarnate Son of the Highest, Bible-songs of praise offered to the adorable Saviour by the heavenly choirs, and by saints on earth. Perhaps it originated in the passionate, unrestrained utterances of mediæval pietists and mystics, and it is sustained by the weak sentimentalities, and the somewhat irreverent Oh’s and Ah’s of certain modern so-called periodical revivalists. How was the idea ever formed, and the idea crystallized into practice, if not in the way of a modernization of Christianity, that, while a subject dare not approach, or address, orally, or scripturally, an earthly potentate, except with every token of the greatest respect and consideration, a guilty mortal presumes to address the most glorious Head of the Church, whom angels worship, repeatedly and familiarly, by His NAME, *without* the prefix Lord, and the application to His Name of adjectives that rather resemble those employed in their mutual intercourse between fond parents and their little children, or, even in the dallying of a couple of silly lovers.

It may be that our subject has been pursued far enough. Suffice it to remark in conclusion that, in respect to all that is stable and unchangeable in Christianity, in respect to all in it pertaining to its doctrine, its requirement, its polity and its cultus, which, an invariable quantity, has manifested its original excellence as the result of the test of centuries, it is to be devoutly hoped that, until the dawn of the millennium, a salutary check may be placed upon the modernizing effort to “remove the landmarks” of a genuine Christianity.

VII.

WILLIAM THE SILENT AND HIS TIMES.

BY THE REV. A. A. PFANSTIEHL.

V.

WILLIAM'S YOUTH AND EDUCATION.

As early as the fourteenth century the ancestors of William, the house of Nassau, obtained possessions in the Netherlands.* To these in the sixteenth century, the Princedom of Orange was added. William, falling heir to this Princedom, which was situated in southern France, near Avignon, obtained his well-known title as *Prince of Orange*. He was born at Dillenburg, belonging to the German Duchy of Nassau, on the 25th of April, 1533. Motley says that the past and present seemed to have gathered together riches and power from many sources in the summons to the high destinies and heroic sacrifices the Prince of Orange was to make not only for his own country, but for the world. He was descended from the Nassau family, the Orange branch of which, as Groen van Prinsterer, one of Holland's great historians, says, was called of God to a task such as no other princely house ever had—the task to watch and strive for the Gospel, liberty and right, not only as the head of the Republic, but also for all Christendom.† The Nassaus had come into distinct notice in history as early as the middle of the eleventh century, exercising sovereignty before the House of Burgundy existed, having as ancestors the Othos, the Engleberts and the Henrys of the Netherlands. They had for centuries held distinguished positions in Germany and the low countries. From one branch of them had come an Emperor of Germany.

* Groen Van Prinsterer. "*Geschiedenis van het Vaderland*," p. 65.

† Idem, p. 66.

When but eleven years of age William of Orange fell heir to all the titles and estates of his cousin Henry, first Prince of Orange from the Nassaus, who was killed in a campaign against the French; these estates included a large domain in Holland, and a richer possession in Brabant, together with the inheritance of Chalons, and the principality of Orange.

From a human point of view the destiny of this boy, so suddenly enriched by titles and wealth, seemed none other than to enter the Emperor's court for education in lines that would bring to him military adventures, embassies, vice-royalties; or, perhaps, just as likely the peculiar temptations to enervation following in the wake of luxury and magnificence, making but meagre chances for him to do his age and people any distinctive good. But, in the inscrutable providence of God, his destiny lay in different ways. This destiny under God was largely predetermined by his noble mother, Juliana of Holberg. "She was a person of most exemplary character and unaffected piety. She instilled into the minds of all her children the elements of that devotional sentiment which was her own striking characteristic, and it was destined that the seed sown early should increase to an abundant harvest." * It was she who wrote to William, late in her life, after three of her sons had already perished in the war that Spain brought upon the Netherlands: "My heart longs for certain tidings from my lord, for methinks the peace now in prospect will prove but an oppression for soul and conscience. † I trust my heart's dearly beloved lord and son will be supported by divine grace to do nothing against God and his own soul's salvation. 'Tis better to lose the temporal than the eternal."

How true it is that

"The mother in her office holds the key
Of the soul, and she it is who stamps the coin
Of character, and makes the being who would be a savage
But for her gentle care, a Christian man."

* Motley: "*Rise*," etc., Vol. I., p. 325.

† Overtures for a false peace were being made to William at this time.

Blessed that nation that has noble mothers. Glorious the history of sons who have and heed the counsels of such mothers. "When Greece and Rome began to breed up conceited, unruly sons, walking after their own hearts' lusts; when Greece produced vicious and perfumed dandies such as Aristophanes pictures in Pheidippides; when Rome produced jewelled debauchees like Otho, and a matricide like Nero;—God, too, began to wipe out their glory as when one wipeth a dish, wiping it and turning it upside down."* At the dedication of a monument † to "Mary, the mother of Washington," the President of the United States, Grover Cleveland, said: "I believe that he who thinks it brave and manly to outgrow his care and devotion for his mother is, more than he who has no music in himself, fit for treason, strategems, and spoils, and should not be trusted."

William's †parents were Lutherans. But the Emperor, Charles V., discerning in their son the making of an influential and powerful man, had no inclination to have him brought up and educated other than in the Catholic faith. Accordingly, he was in his twelfth year removed to Brussels, where he was under the care and brought up in the family of Mary of Hungary, sister of Charles, Regent of the low countries. Here he received a princely education. He was always a favorite of the Emperor, so that at the age of fifteen years he was a trusted page in the family of Charles, who recognized his superior qualities by making him all but a confidential friend, permitting him to be present when he held private interviews with highest dignitaries and upon the gravest affairs. The Emperor frankly admitted that the young prince had often made wise suggestions, such as had escaped his own sagacity. When William was not yet twenty-one years of age, Charles appointed him General-in-chief of the army on the frontier of France. And a few years later he entrusted to him the distinguishing honor of bearing the imperial crown to Ferdinand.

Thus early did God put this Moses of the Netherlands to

* Canon Farrar.

† 1894.

school where he had admirable opportunities to develop his natural keenness and depth of mind in an exercise that made him peculiarly capable of filling the position he was destined to occupy.

Philip from the very first not only distrusted, but feared William. As has been said: "Philip II. saw quickly and deeply into a character, which, among good ones, most resembled his own. If he had not seen through him so clearly, his distrust of a man, in whom were united nearly all the qualities which he prized highest, and could best appreciate, would be quite inexplicable. . . . In him Philip had to deal with an antagonist who was armed against his policy, and who in a good cause could also command the resources of a bad one. And it was exactly this last circumstance which accounts for his having hated this man so implacably above all others of his day, and his having had so supernatural a dread of him." * Philip knew that William was master alike in reading and winning men's hearts.

At the early age of eighteen he had married Anne of Egmont, who soon died. And on the 25th of August, 1561, with princely pomp, nearly 6,000 persons attending the marriage feast, he married Anne of Saxony, a very rich heiress. He lived in magnificent state in Brussels, showing extensive hospitality to rich and poor, and by unfeigned frankness and kindness to all classes, became the most popular and beloved prince in the land. This had not escaped Philip's notice. His hatred of William rose in proportion to the latter's gain in the love and confidence of the people. However hard Philip endeavored to conceal his true feelings towards William, he could not deceive him. In fact, when the Prince, in company with other nobles, had gone with Philip to Flushing, where the King was to embark for Spain, Philip acrimoniously accused William of being the author of the troubles in the country. William answered in his usual calmness, that the Provinces had acted upon their own suggestion, and according to their vested rights. Philip, seizing William's hand and shaking it

* Schiller's Works, Vol. I., p. 407.

violently, said: "No, no, not the Provinces, but, You! you! you!" Unperturbed, but deeply affected, and with thoughtful brow, William, not waiting for the King's departure, wishing him a safe journey, left for his home in Brussels.

Although Philip hated him, still he was forced to recognize him in his appointments. He was sent to France to negotiate the treaty of Cateau Cambresis. The treaty was formed. William was selected by Henry of France as one of the hostages for the due execution of the treaty. It was at this time that he learned of the secret scheme of Henry II. of France, and Philip II. of Spain, for the extirpation of Protestantism. While hunting with the royal company one day, the French King and the Prince found themselves alone, separated from the rest of the company. The King's heart was full of the designs of himself and Philip, in which they had solemnly bound themselves to massacre all the converts to Protestantism in France and the Netherlands. The cruel Duke of Alva was at this very time on a visit to Henry, with the view of perfecting the arrangements for this wholesale slaughter. The King, thinking that William of Orange was a party to the plot, or, at least, would be in full sympathy with it, spoke freely, with French enthusiasm and volubility, to him about it, laying before him the details of it, minutely describing the manner in which all the heretics, whether of high or humble station, were to be discovered and killed at a most convenient moment. The King explained how necessary it was, in order to carry out the plot in the Netherlands, that the Spanish troops be retained in the country. The whole thing came to the Prince like a flash of livid light direct from hell; his noble blood was fired with intense indignation; he was horror-stricken at the revelation made, yet his countenance changed not; not a word escaped his lips, that for a single instant could give the King the least suspicion of the enormous blunder he had made in giving a "warning of inestimable value to the man who had been born to resist the machinations of Philip and of Alva." This silence won for him the name, *William the Silent*.

From the hour of that interview, the life-purpose of the Prince of Orange was irrevocably fixed. In mind he saw that—using his own language—“an Inquisition for the Netherlands had been resolved upon more cruel than that of Spain; since it would need but to look askance at an image, to be cast into the flames.” This, by the help of the Almighty, must not be,—*shall not be!*

After a few days he obtains leave to visit the Netherlands. Here he informed his fellow-princes of what he had learned, and at once took measures to excite opposition to the Spanish troops remaining in the country.

Thus, then, did this man come to take up his life-work—a work that cost him continual self-denial and sacrifice. He was now twenty-seven years of age. Rich, surrounded by dazzling luxury, living, as says a historian, “among the primrose paths.” He was powerful, held sovereign rank. He was still nominally a Catholic, adhering to its outward rites and ceremonies, the only thing for a personage of high rank at that time to do in order to maintain a standing, for “it was only tanners, dyers, and apostate priests who were Protestants at that day in the Netherlands.”

Why, then, did he take upon himself the self-sacrificing task, which he must have known would cost him dear, of protecting these from suffering for a religion that he himself did not adhere to? The answer to this question opens up to view the grandeur of the man. Though he had carefully avoided dwelling much in mind upon religious doctrines, and though having as yet no religious sympathy for the reformers, yet he could not, he said, “but feel compassion for so many virtuous men and women thus devoted to massacre;” and his great heart led him to endeavor to save them if he could.

A person is safe whose heart has within it—be it but in germ—what has been felicitously called “the enthusiasm of humanity.” It is this that leads men to take up unpopular tasks,—undertakings that the world may call Quixotic, and laugh at a man for undertaking to do,—but which above all

need to be done, and once undertaken lead to glorious good for mankind. "It is," says a writer of this century, "a calumny on men to say that they are roused to heroic action by ease, hope of pleasure, recompense,—sugar-plums of any kind, in this world or the next." No, but it is an "enthusiasm of humanity that fires all great souls to heroic deeds," and sustains them in attempting to do them, even though Gethsemanes and a cross stand in the way!

It was not ease, hope of pleasure, recompense either in this world or the next, that led William of Orange to take up his work. 'Tis true, perhaps, that when he first undertook it, he little knew what it would really lead to. But he soon learned what it was to be. And realizing its importance to the world, he was fired with heroic determination to carry it on till death would relieve him; although from the hour that he began his work, his character was to be the mark of slander, and he was to be misunderstood and misinterpreted. He remarked, at one time during his career with pathos, and not without truth: "It seems to me that I was born in this bad planet that all which I do might be misinterpreted." Notwithstanding this, his zeal was not abated, nor did it deter him one moment from pursuing his determined course. "To be great," says Emerson, "is to be misunderstood." And yet how mortally afraid men are of this. They trim, they cater, they apologize, they hesitate for fear of it. To quote Emerson again: "Misunderstood! It is a right fools' word. Is it so bad, then, to be misunderstood? Pythagoras was misunderstood; and Socrates, and Jesus, and Luther, and Copernicus, and Galileo, and Newton, and every pure and wise spirit that ever took flesh." The misinterpretation or misunderstanding of the world is not to be feared so much as being untrue to ourselves and to our God. God never misinterprets. God never misunderstands. "What," asks Canon Farrar, "to a good man are all the lies, all the hisses, if conscience whispers, 'Thou hast kept innocency?' Die in thy simplicity, and let the muddy, abhorrent stream of human vileness, of human falsehood roll on, till God sees fit to cleanse it. Why,

this was enough for the virtuous heathen. Socrates can smile even as he drinks the hemlock; Arria can pluck the dagger from her heart and say, 'My Poetus, it does not hurt;' Regulus could go back to the prison of torture like a consul to his triumph—

'One self-approving hour whole worlds outweighs,
Of stupid starers, and of loud huzzas;
And more true joy Marcellus, exiled, feels,
Than Caesar with a Senate at his heels.'

"And if it were so with the heathen, what must it be with the Christian, who, even in the flames of martyrdom feels the spirit of God wreath about him as with a moist, whistling wind, and who amid the rabble's yell hears the ineffable whisper, '*Servant of God, well done!*'"

Philip II. of Spain misinterpreted and misunderstood the Prince of Orange, and hence used every endeavor possible, bribery, flattery, threatening, deceit, to cause him to swerve from his purpose; but, even though the people whom he served at immense personal sacrifice, often misinterpreted him, yet he remained true to himself and his high task,—aye, grew stronger and broader in it, until what was for and to him at first but a feeling of compassion for some virtuous men and women devoted to massacre, had grown into a stand for religious and civil liberty, not for his age and people alone, but for all ages to come, and for the world. Even to the very last, with rock-like firmness, he stood almost alone in the great struggle, the provinces again and again having faltered, although he knew that his stand meant a continuance of hostilities. The Prince learned to know, "what no man else appeared fully to comprehend at that epoch—that the mortal combat between the Inquisition and the Reformation was already fully engaged. The great battle between divine reason and right divine, on which the interests of unborn generations were hanging, was to be fought out before the eyes of all Christendom on the plain of the Netherlands." Therefore, war or peace, he must not give up his principle. He would not pay the price demanded for

peace, viz., the speaking and acting lies, giving over a people to religious and civil thralldom, and giving up a principle he had come to see was an invaluable boon to humanity.

He has been accused of being the means of keeping up the bloody contest in the Netherlands. But he was not war-like by nature. He was gentle. He was kind. He was tender-hearted, as, indeed, every truly valiant man is. Nothing could be more tender than the final parting of the Prince and Egmont, when the former hung about the neck of the latter, and wept like a child. Nothing could bespeak his tender-heartedness more than when he was found in the most frank, honest, natural way conversing with workmen and fishermen, who offered him drink out of their own coarse cups; they invited him into their houses, they allowed him to settle their differences, and even submitted family quarrels to him, which he wisely settled, re-establishing peace in the household. Everywhere he was called by the people: "*Father William.*"

But peace he knew meant war in its worst form. Above all, and animating all in him was the love of principle. *That* must stand. He recognized that it could not stand without a struggle. Therefore, he braced himself—iron-clad—to endure, aye, if necessary, to inaugurate the contest.

VI.

THE BEGINNINGS OF REVOLT.

The revolt in the Netherlands against the Spanish Government was slow in taking definite shape and did not do so until the troubles became so complicated and so serious that the Netherlands were forced to it.

The position in the new Government in 1559 was such that protests, dissensions, and the beginnings of the revolt could not but take place. Charles V. had not hesitated to enforce the Inquisition with sternness and sanguinary spirit; and it became evident in Philip's reign that he would not less, but more vigorously and cruelly press it. And yet this had not in the least

brought about revolt. It may seem strange, as Campbell suggests, that such a people as the Netherlanders should submit so long to such religious persecution before revolting against it. But he well writes: "A little reflection, however, suggests the answer. In the first place, they were pre-eminently a peaceful race, engaged in commerce and manufactures, and for many years unused to war, while their ruler commanded the largest and best disciplined armies of the world. Next, those who suffered from the Inquisition under Charles V. were all from the poorer classes, and the death of a few thousand scattered peasants or artisans made but little impression on any community three centuries ago. There was no concert of action among the victims or their friends, and they were in a small and weak minority. In addition, the excesses of some of the early reformers excited the fears of the timid, and in the religious excitement of the times many of the supporters of the established church became as zealous in its reformation and defence as were the Protestants in their opposition to it."*

The circumstances of Philip's reign from its very beginning were different from those under Charles V. Charles was a great favorite with the people. Philip was soon despised, suspected and feared. Charles gave every evidence that he desired to conciliate the nation; Philip from the very first could not conceal feelings the very reverse of this.

The appointment of Margaret as Regent had been a bitter pill to the aristocracy. Yet they were inclined to submit peaceably. But when Philip, in spite of remonstrances, persisted in garrisoning the country with hated Spanish troops, the discontent assumed serious aspects. Not only because it was opposed to the spirit of all their privileges, which freed them from the compulsory burden of sustaining foreign troops, but the country had suffered a famine the year before, and it was an intolerable burden to have these men to support, whose presence in the country was uncalled for, and for whose stay no good reasons

* "The Puritan in Holland, England and America," Vol. I., p. 173, by Douglas Campbell.

could be given. The discontent became popular and universal. Some declared they would all rather perish with families and property, in the sea, than to submit to the ravages of these starving soldiers. So serious became the outlook that Margaret and Granvelle both counselled Philip to dismiss the soldiers. Accordingly the troops were withdrawn, with the secret preparation being hastened to invade the country with a new and better equipped army, that would soon, as Philip thought, quell all revolt.

At the same time another measure was proposed that awakened violent opposition on the part of the Netherlanders. There were but three Bishoprics in the country. The king proposed, ostensibly for the betterment of the spiritual condition of the people, but really so as to be enabled the better to carry out his inquisitorial plans in extirpating heretics, to appoint twelve. Universal opposition against this arose at once. The nobility saw in this increase of Bishops, a strengthening of royalty in the diet; the abbots and monks realized that they would be curtailed in their incomes for the support of the new bishoprics; the Protestants, of course, feared such a move; hence dismay seized all classes of the people. They cried out that their liberties were being invaded; that they were to be in perpetual surveillance of the Roman See. "Who," it was asked, "will after this venture to raise his voice in Parliament before such observers, or, in their presence, dare to protect the rights of the nation against the rapacious hands of the government? They will trace out the resources of the provinces, and betray to the Crown the secrets of our freedom and our property. They will obstruct the way to all offices of honor; we shall soon see the courtiers of the King succeed the present men; the children of foreigners will, for the future, fill the Parliament, and the private interests of their patron will guide their venal votes." To this the monks added: "What an act of oppression to pervert to other objects the pious designs of our holy institutions, to condemn the inviolable wishes of the dead, and to take that which a devout charity has deposited in

our chests for the relief of the unfortunates and make it subservient to the luxury of bishops, thus inflating their arrogant pomp with the plunder of the poor."

The nobles, thinking that Granvelle had been the principal cause of these movements, had refused to attend the Council of State. When he was recalled they returned, only to find that measures, instead of being made better, were more hatefully increased in evil to the country. Violent speeches were made in the Council. William of Orange made such a powerful address that it occasioned the President of the Council, Viglius, an attack of apoplexy which nearly proved fatal.

It had been decided that a message should be sent to Philip apprising him of the critical condition of affairs. The debate in the council was as to the instructions that should be given to the envoy. Viglius had prepared a paper wherein nothing definite was said. When William was called upon to vote, he spoke at length, with tremendous eloquence. There was to be no utterance of glittering generalities; no mincing of matters; the time had come to speak out in unequivocal terms; the plain truth was to be told. The King was to be informed just how the free provinces felt on the matter of the Spanish Inquisition being introduced among them; of the new bishoprics; and that the decrees of the Council of Trent, abhorred by the whole world, could not and would not be allowed to be enforced in the Netherlands.

Count Egmont, who was greatly esteemed by the people, a bold, unsuspected patriot, a soldier who had rendered the King valiant service, was chosen as the message-bearer. He was instructed to positively inform the King that the Inquisition, more bishoprics, edicts and executioners were no longer tenable and must go, or the hour for the abolition of the Government as it had been, was come.

It may well be imagined how Philip would look upon such a message. He was duly informed what to expect. He, therefore, planned accordingly. Though looking upon the whole matter with utmost aversion, he received Egmont cordially,

feasted him, listened with apparent interest and deference to what he had to say, giving him profuse promises that the matters complained of would be remedied as speedily as possible, and made his journey one flattering, joyous holiday, from which he returned, as he himself wrote, "the happiest man in the world." Philip had reckoned well with his guest. Egmont's frankness and cordiality were proverbial, and he was as vain as he was frank; hence the King could easily dupe him into a feeling of the brightest hopefulness for the future.

But what was the King's real state of mind? He had assembled a conclave of ecclesiastics, to whom, after stating the condition of affairs in the Netherlands, he put the question as to what their opinion of the matter was. They supposed that the King desired to shift the responsibility from himself upon them in allowing what seemed inevitable, and therefore answered him that "considering the critical situation of Flanders, and the imminent danger, if thwarted, of its disloyalty to the crown, and total defection from the Church, he might be justified in allowing the people freedom of worshiping in their own way." They had missed the mark. Philip sternly replied that "he had not called them to learn whether he *might* grant this to the Flemings, but whether he *must* do so." The prompt answer was: "No." Then, prostrating himself on the ground before a crucifix, he exclaimed: "I implore Thy divine majesty, Ruler of all things, that Thou keep me in the mind that I am in, never to allow myself to become or to be called the lord of those who reject Thee for their Lord." Just what meaning was to be attached to the promises that he sent by Egmont, may be learned from this strongly expressed statement in sealed instructions brought to Margaret the Regent, by a messenger from Spain, soon after Egmont's departure: "I would rather lose a hundred thousand lives, if I had so many, than allow a single change in matters of religion." The instructions were for stricter enforcement of the edicts;—not a word about reforms or concessions was mentioned.

None better than William, Prince of Orange, understood how

completely the King had deceived Egmont. The people soon after discovered this, when an express command from Spain caused the Council of State to enjoin that the decrees of the Council of Trent, the edicts and the Inquisition, should be promulgated in every city and village of the Netherlands every six months. In the edicts "it was forbidden to print, copy, keep, hide, buy or sell any writing of Luther, Zwingli, Æculampadius, Bucer, Calvin, or of any other heretic; to break or to injure any image of the Virgin, or of the Saints; to hold or to attend any heretical conventicle. Laymen were prohibited from reading the Scriptures, or taking part in conferences, upon disputed points of doctrine. Transgressors, in case they should not recant, were, if they were men, to be beheaded; if women, to be buried alive. If obstinate, they were to be burnt alive, and, in either case, their property was to be confiscated. To omit to inform against suspicious persons, to entertain, lodge, feed or clothe them, was to be guilty of heresy. Persons who, for the reason that they were suspected, were condemned to abjure heresy, were, in case they rendered themselves again suspicious, to be dealt with as heretics. Every accuser, in case of conviction, was to receive a large share of the confiscated goods. Judges were absolutely forbidden to diminish in any way the prescribed penalties. Severe penalties were threatened against any who should intercede for heretics, or present a petition in behalf of them." *

The effect of all this upon the country was deadening to commerce; the foreign merchants fled; marts of trade, especially Antwerp, were deserted. Consternation, followed by indignation, stirred the people to violent measures.

Definite shape was given to the revolt against the despotism of Philip by the nobles, who, joined by wealthy merchants, signed an agreement to withstand the oppression. Some five hundred nobles signed. A "Request" was prepared by them to be presented in a body to Margaret. William of Orange did not take any leading part in this. He thought the action use-

* See Fisher: "History of the Reformation," p. 294.

less and premature. He simply counselled them after the "Request" had been decided on, as to the language of the document. His great desire was, as he wrote to a friend at this time, to save his country from ruin, "and so many innocent persons from slaughter. But when I say anything in the Council I am sure to be misinterpreted. So I am greatly perplexed; since speech and silence are equally bad."

Indeed, though now but little past thirty years of age, he was growing prematurely old. He was no longer "the brilliant and careless grandee" that he was when he began housekeeping in Brussels. His sleepless nights, his careworn days, began to show themselves in his face and figure. "They say that the Prince is very sad," wrote Morillon to Granvelle: "and 'tis easy to read as much in his face. They say *he cannot sleep*." *

The "Request" prepared by the nobles, called for the withdrawal of the edicts, and the Inquisition, and that the States-General should have the management of affairs in the country.

On the fifth of April, 1566, the confederates appeared before the Regent. It was an impressive scene. Brederode read the address in a solemn meeting of the assembly. Margaret was so agitated as the reading proceeded that she could scarcely restrain herself. Barlaymont, noticing her nervousness and perturbation, said: "What, Madam, is it possible your highness can fear these beggars?"

Margaret gave an evasive answer. 'Twas all she could well do under the circumstances. To accede to the request was as much out of the question as was the peremptory ignoring of it.

The nobles soon after this met in their regular session. The remark of Barlaymont was recalled and discussed. Brederode rose and said: "They call us beggars. Let us adopt the name. We will resist the Inquisition; but we will remain true to the King, and to the Beggars' Wallet." Thus was the new movement in the Netherlands christened with the name that has come down into history, and became so full of terror and significance to the Spanish soldiery. The term "Beggars" was

* Motley: "*Rise*," etc., Vol. I., p. 442.

everywhere adopted by the people, and spread throughout the country. The nobles dressed themselves and their families in plain gray clothes, the garb of mendicant monks, and fastened in their caps a little wooden porringer. A coin was struck off called the "Beggar's Penny," with the image of the King on one side, and two hands holding a beggar's wallet on the other. This medal was hung about people's necks.

This movement of the nobles nerved the people to demonstrations of enthusiastic resistance to the Inquisition. Large gatherings were held wherein the situation of affairs was freely discussed. The authorities endeavored to disperse these meetings; but regular encampments were formed, and armed resistance was offered; men guarding the congregation "with guns, pike, and sword in hand, listening to the eloquence of impassioned preachers."

Margaret was helpless. People cared little for edicts, and she could not even order or persuade the militia of Antwerp to be called out to her aid in dispersing the people.

None watched all this with wiser interest and deeper solicitude than William of Orange. He persuaded the Regent not to interfere with the field-preaching as long as the worshippers did not invade the towns.

But it was impossible that this preaching should continue to be peaceful and dignified. Excesses must needs come. Accordingly an outbreak came in Antwerp on August 15, 1566, just four months after the "Beggars" had presented their petition. It was occasioned by a large procession of Catholic clergy, making a pompous display, greatly annoying the Protestants. People jeered at the procession, crying out: "Maijken, Maijken (little Mary, little Mary), your hour is come. 'Tis your last promenade. The city is tired of you." *

The following morning a mixed multitude was gathered around the Cathedral. That day the rabble excited a tumult in the church, which, however, was quelled before night. But

* The principal object of this procession was to carry around the city a colossal image of the Virgin. See Motley, "*Rise*," etc., Vol. I., p. 556.

the next morning the crowds again surged to the Cathedral. Motley thus describes the day: "The same taunts and imprecations were hurled at the image of the Virgin; the same howling of the beggar's cry resounded through the lofty arches. For a few hours no act of violence was committed, but the crowd increased. A few trifles, drifting, as usual before the event, seemed to indicate the approaching convulsion. A very paltry old woman excited the image-breaking at Antwerp. She had for years been accustomed to sit before the door of the Cathedral with wax-tapers and wafers, earning a scanty subsistence from the profits of her meagre trade, and by the small coins which she sometimes received in charity. Some of the rabble began to chaffer with this ancient huckstress. They scoffed at her consecrated wares; they bandied with her ribald jests, of which her public position had furnished her with a supply; they assured her that the hour had come when her idolatrous traffic was to be forever terminated, when she and her patroness, Mary, were to be given over to destruction together. The old woman, enraged, answered threat with threat, and gibe with gibe. Passing from words to deeds, she began to catch from the ground every offensive missile or weapon which she could find, and to lay about her in all directions. Her tormentors defended themselves as they could. Having destroyed her whole stock-in-trade, they provoked others to appear in her defence. The passers-by thronged to the scene; the Cathedral was soon filled to overflowing; a furious tumult was already in progress."

The magistrates having been informed of this, hastened to allay the troubles, and had almost succeeded, when, neglecting to lock all the doors of the Cathedral, they gave an opportunity for the rabble to enter. The work of destruction began amid wild yells. Images, pictures, statues, ornaments, were ruthlessly broken into thousands of pieces; sledge-hammers, clubs, axes, ropes, ladders, all were used. "Every statue was hurled from its niche, every picture torn from the wall, every wonderfully-painted window shattered to atoms, every ancient monument

shattered, every sculptured decoration, however inaccessible in appearance, hurled to the ground,"—and thus long into the night did the work go on until one of the most magnificent churches then in existence was made a wreck.

Other places, hearing of the destruction of the images at Antwerp, also entered upon the work of demolition. In Brabant and Flanders alone more than four hundred churches were ravaged.

Margaret was in fear and distress, and was about to flee from Brussels. William of Orange, Egmont and Horn restrained her, and induced her to publish the armistice, known as the Act of the 25th of August, by which preaching was allowed, and the Inquisition was, for the time at least, abolished.

Upon this the nobles endeavored to pacify the people. William succeeded in Antwerp. Egmont, using harsh measures in Flanders, disappointed the people, and was not successful in establishing quiet.

Boundless rage filled the heart of Philip when the reports of the iconoclasm reached him. With characteristic craftiness, however, he endeavored to conceal it, writing letters of moderation and even giving promises of visiting the country in person, expressing a wish to re-establish order by means of grace and mercy. Schiller has well written: "To curb the overgrown power and insolence of the nobility, there was no expedient more natural than the presence of their master. Before royalty itself, all secondary dignities must necessarily have sunk in the shade, all other splendor be dimmed. Instead of the truth being left to flow slowly and obscurely through impure channels to the distant throne, so that procrastinated measures of redress gave time to ripen ebullitions of the moment into acts of deliberation, his own penetrating glance would at once have been able to separate truth from error; and cold policy alone, not to speak of his humanity, would have saved the land a million citizens. The nearer to their source, the more weighty would his edicts have been; the thicker they fell on their objects, the weaker and the more dispirited would have become

the efforts of the rebels. It costs infinitely more to do an evil to an enemy in his presence than in his absence. . . . Philip's appearance in Brussels would have put an end at once to this juggling. In that case the rebels would have been compelled to act up to their pretense, or to cast aside the mask ; and so, by appearing in their true shape, condemn themselves. And what a relief for the Netherlands if the King's presence had only spared them those evils which were inflicted upon them without his knowledge, and contrary to his will ! What gain, too, even if it had only enabled him to watch over the expenditure of the vast sums which, illegally raised on the plea of meeting the exigencies of the war, disappeared in the plundering hands of his deputies !" *

But Philip had no idea of visiting the Netherlands. His promises to do so deceived all but William of Orange. Remembering his conversation with Henry of France, in regard to Philip's settled policy, he had established a system of espionage over every act and word spoken and written by Philip, regularly receiving copies of all Philip's most secret dispatches. He, therefore, knew that instead of mercy and grace, of which the king wrote, they could expect only the most cruel and merciless revenge. And he had learned that this revenge was to be especially wreaked upon himself, Egmont, and Horn. Communicating this knowledge to Egmont, he urged him to join him either in flight or in armed resistance to the expected invasion by a Spanish army. But Egmont was blind to all danger, and sided with the government. Horn, weary of the strife, discouraged with losses of property, retired into solitude. William was left alone—misunderstood, but none the less resolved that he would do what he could to save his country. He knew full well that to go blindly forward, as matters were now wildly shaping themselves, would be as useless as it would be fatal.

Besides this, all public officers were at this time required to take a new oath of allegiance, by which they bound themselves to implicit obedience to all orders of the government, every-

* Works, Vol. I., pp. 358, 359.

where and against every person without distinction ; this the Prince of Orange would never do. It was utterly repugnant to him to make blind pledges—and especially to a king such as he had learned Philip to be, and in matters such as he knew were determined upon by the government. It was either, take the oath or resign all offices. He unhesitatingly did the latter, and made preparations to retire to his possessions in Germany. Not indeed as fleeing from danger, or leaving a sinking cause to its fate, but with a full knowledge that to remain in the country would disable him to serve the cause he had espoused ; whereas, away from danger, amid which he was helpless, he could devise some means of help.

He made one more attempt to rescue his friend Egmont from his suicidal infatuation ; but in vain. Egmont protested his faith in the king's clemency and good-will to him. William replied : " Alas ! Egmont, the king's clemency, of which you boast, will destroy you. Would that I might be deceived ; but I foresee too clearly, that you are to be the bridge which the Spaniards will destroy, so soon as they have passed over it to invade our country." This was at their last meeting on earth. After the prince had said this, he threw his arms around Egmont, and tears rolled down the cheeks of both.

A story goes—though Motley denies its truth—that at parting Egmont insinuated that William, in fleeing, showed a want of courage. But what was the prince to do but to flee for a time ? He knew full well that preparations had been made and were about to be consummated for a Spanish invasion of the country that meant complete subjugation, and that the nobles were the first to be taken. Egmont had refused to join him in preventing this, or at least getting ready to meet and resist it ; Horn had retired ; the confederacy of nobles, whose meetings had been little else than a series of noisy banquets, was now broken up ; he knew it would be but suicidal to remain ; no possible good could come from his doing so, and much probable harm. Hence, he wisely and for the good of his country, retired to Dillenberg, in Germany.

With William's departure, matters in the Netherlands took a sombre aspect. Thousands, and tens of thousands—indeed, over 100,000 people—left the country with their possessions. The Inquisition was again re-instated, with renewed vigor and cruelty. Fugitives were ruthlessly sought out, pursued, murdered. "Hardly a village so small but that it could furnish one, two, or three hundred victims to the executioner. The new churches were leveled to the ground, and out of their timbers gallows were constructed." * Hopelessness settled over the homes of the people; hopefulness brightened the sky of the government. And the Spanish army, already in marching order, it was thought would soon completely establish permanently the present condition of things, when all rebellion seemed to have been quelled, the confederacy of nobles broken up, the sects extirpated, the Roman Catholic worship fully restored, the rebels imprisoned, and the towns securely garrisoned with troops.

VII.

ALVA'S ARRIVAL.

When, on Egmont's return from his fruitless mission to Spain, Philip had the ordinance passed that every six months the decrees of the Council of Trent, the edicts and the Inquisition should be publicly read, William of Orange whispered to his neighbor in the Council that passed the decree, that before long the most extraordinary tragedy would now begin that the world's history had ever recorded. The prophecy was about to be fulfilled.

The king, contrary to the advice of Margaret and some of his most loyal Spanish counsellors, determined to send an army that would once for all bring the provinces into full subjection. To this he had been urged by Duke Alva, who thirsted for the blood of the Netherlanders. The king decided to send him at the head of a picked army, the flower of the Spanish soldiers.

* Motley, "*Rise*," etc., Vol. II., p. 96.

Alva had won for himself, under Charles V., an honorable name as a soldier; indeed, he was considered the greatest general of his age, and was pronounced by friends and foes alike the greatest military genius Spain had produced in that age of remarkable soldiery. Such he has been considered, until late researches prove that he was not capable of conducting great operations, however skillful he was in leading small forces in perpetrating cruelties that reek of hell. "In person he was tall, thin, erect, with a small head, a long visage, lean yellow cheek, dark twinkling eyes, adust complexion, black bristling hair, and a long sable-silvered beard, descending in two waving strains upon his breast."*

Philip chose him as leader of this expedition because Alva was his exact counterpart. He, like Philip, heartily detested "heretics;" he, like Philip, was heartless in the extreme; treacherous, knowing of no mercy, caring little for justice if only he could be revenged upon those whom he had come to chastise.

It was on the 10th of May, 1567, that Alva, at the head of ten thousand veterans, thoroughly organized, embarked for their bloody work in the Netherlands.† The march was orderly, and terminated with no unusual incidents. In August the army arrived at Luxemburg.

Margaret dreaded Alva's coming. She knew, only too well, that it meant subjugation on her part; and she had knowledge enough of the people to fear that his coming would only fan into larger flames the spirit of revolt, that had been subdued, but not quenched. The people at large, too, were struck with horror; the more, because he distributed his troops—"detested vermin," in the language of the Hollanders—throughout the cities and towns. Their presence was made obnoxious by insolence, added to cruelties. Thousands of the best citizens fled the country. The arts and manufactures that had made the

* Motley, "*Rise*," etc., Vol. II., 109.

† "The army was worthy of the general. He commanded the finest and the most merciless troops in Europe." Roger's "*Holland*," p. 73.

country rich and powerful, were taken away with the emigrants ; and everywhere, especially in Brussels, where Alva made his headquarters, gloom and desolation fell upon the land.

Alva had received secret instructions from Philip. The first work to be undertaken by him was to take the leaders in the late disturbances, and forever make them safe from doing any more mischief ; then to ferret out every suspicious and guilty person among the people, and force the wealth of the country into the treasury and to the support of the troops.

The Duke of Alva had all along, with Philip, believed that the difficulties in the Netherlands were due largely to the nobles of the Provinces ; especially Egmont, William of Orange, Horn, and Hoogstraten. Their idea was, that if these could be executed, the people could easily be brought into subjection. Alva's first remark on arriving in the country was : " I, who have tamed people of iron, shall soon manage these people of butter." It cost Philip and Alva dear to become undeceived as to their task !

Their first object, therefore, was to arrest these leaders and without much ceremony execute them. Alva was disappointed to learn that Orange was gone. But Egmont was at hand. Alva met him with blandishments ; deceived him with all manner of kind words. Egmont, never suspecting the poisonous fangs under the smooth tongue, received him with great cordiality. Horn was still in retirement. It was not easy to coax him out of his resting-place. But kind letters, profuse flatteries, promises of important commissions that would secure him both honors and riches, at last enticed the prey. Hoogstraten and Orange were safe in Germany.

The plans for the arrest of Egmont and Horn were well laid. A banquet had been prepared to which they were invited. Egmont had been repeatedly warned against the entrapment. The evening before the arrest a Spaniard sent a solemn message urging him to flee from Alva before morning. Unheeding of it, he attended the banquet the next day. During the feast, orders came from Alva for Egmont and Horn to meet him at

his house, to plan with him concerning fortifications at Antwerp. Don Ferdinando, the host, at this time whispered to Egmont: "Leave this place, Signor Count, instantly; take the fleetest horse in your stable and make your escape without a moment's delay." He was now being aroused to a sense of danger. Noircames asked him the cause of his agitation. He told him what he had just heard. "Ha! Count," said Noircames, "do not put lightly such implicit confidence in this stranger, who is counselling you to your destruction. What will the Duke of Alva and all the Spaniards say of such a precipitate flight? Will they not say that your excellency has fled from the consciousness of guilt? Will not your escape be construed into a confession of high treason?" This speech settled Egmont's fate. He and Horn went to Alva's house, and while they were looking over the plans their dwellings were being searched, papers and valuables confiscated, secretaries arrested; and in the evening, when they were about to leave Alva's house, they found themselves under arrest and securely imprisoned. The plot had been admirably planned and well worked out. Alva had not given the slightest intimation that this perfidious treatment awaited them; on the contrary, he had treated them with the utmost confidence and courtesy. Indeed, Alva on the morning of the arrest had ridden one of the horses presented to him by Egmont.

Other arrests were made on the same day—a day when horrors were begun that cause amazement, both at the power of endurance on the part of brave men, and the hard-hearted cruelty of a despot.

Joy reigned supreme in Philip's heart because of Alva's desperate acts. At Rome, too, there was rejoicing. Granvelle, however, was not so jubilant when he heard that William of Orange had escaped. He remarked, that since *he* was not arrested, nobody had been taken; and that "his capture would have been more valuable than that of every man in the Netherlands."

On the other hand, great consternation filled the provinces

at the arrest of Egmont and Horn. In consequence of it, emigration increased rapidly, so that Alva was compelled to use measures to stop it. With the thousands and tens of thousands already gone, and thousands more going, it looked as though the country would soon be depleted.

And yet, the story of suffering, disappointment, cruelty, surprises, perfidy, bloodshed, appalling to tell, was but just beginning to be written in the blood of the brave Netherlanders.

VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

DEATH AND THE RESURRECTION. An Inquiry into their True Nature. By Calvin S. Gerhard, D.D. Philadelphia: Charles G. Fisher, 907 Arch street. Price, \$1.25.

This is a notable book and one that deserves, as we are sure it will receive, serious attention from the theological world as well as from the Christian public in general. Thoughtful, earnest, suggestive, and devout, it furnishes food for thought, emphasizes the precious truth of the gospel, and strengthens faith in the supernatural realities of divine revelation. At the same time it makes earnest with the facts established by natural science, and treats its difficult theme with commendable candor and remarkable ability. Every page of the book gives evidence of wide reading, careful study, and vigor of thought, while the style in which it is written is forcible, clear, and sparkling. It is not likely that any one will take up the book without reading it through; or, reading it through, lay it down without finding, however much he may differ from the author in some of his conclusions, that his mental horizon has been widened, and his insight into Scripture deepened.

The subject treated of is of profound significance, not only because death is the common lot of all men, but, also, because the question of a future life, and therefore, also, the significance of the present life, is so intimately connected with it. It is safe to say, we think, that on no other subject have the Scriptures been more generally misunderstood. We all know that before the science of Geology revealed to us the past history of the earth, it was universally believed that death had entered the world only after Adam's transgression, and that sin caused the subjection of men and animals to the law of mortality. To-day no one conversant with the facts would think of accepting such a statement with reference to the animal world. We all know that for thousands upon thousands of years death reigned in the animal world, before man ever appeared upon the earth, precisely as it does now; and, this fact is not in conflict with the teachings of the Scriptures. Now our author goes a step farther and insists that man, possessing a physical constitution similar to that of the animal, is equally subject, from that point of view, to the law of decay and physical dissolution. The Scriptures

make a distinction between physical dissolution, as such, and death as the wages of sin. The former was not an after-thought, but belongs to God's original plan of the world. The latter is a spiritual effect in the moral sphere, because due to a moral cause. Sin did not originate, but profoundly modifies, natural decease.

If there has been a misconception of the fact which we call death (accounted for by our ignorance of the past history of the earth), so also there has been a misconception of the resurrection, because of our ignorance of the physical sciences. The revivification of the corpse (in a higher, glorified form, it is true) was supposed to be an essential element of the resurrection. We know now that the resuscitation of the corpse, as to its constituent particles of matter, is entirely out of the question. Here again the author goes a step further than our current theology, and brings out in a striking way the distinction between the *body* and the corpse. The latter, as soon as death has taken place, whatever associations may be connected with it or reverence may be due to it, has served its purpose and is henceforth useless to the life of the spirit. The former, however, is essential to the persistence of consciousness and the maintenance of identity. The idea, entertained by many, of disembodied existence on the part of the spirit until the day of the final resurrection is an error, equally at variance with sound philosophy and the teachings of the Scriptures. As in this life the body is not matter, but *organized* matter, so after death there is raised, through the agency of the soul or spirit, a new body, an organization in a new, higher sphere, as the adequate medium in and through which the operations of spiritual life are carried forward. This, too, is involved in man's original constitution. But in Jesus Christ it is brought to light, realized, perfected, and carried forward to its ultimate goal, the complete glorification of redeemed humanity. The resurrection is, therefore, to be conceived of as a process, as well as a final event. It begins in this world, reaches an important epoch at death, and is completed at the final consummation.

Space fails us to follow the author's argument in detail. He is, of course, traversing difficult ground; but we think he succeeds, generally, in making his meaning clear. If in any respect he fails to do so, it must be remembered that we know so little of the conditions of life beyond the present order, of the nature of matter and its relation to higher energies, of its capability of *glorification*, as we are accustomed to call it, and of the ultimate state to which human development will attain, that it is not easy to put into language, based on our ordinary experience in the present state, a consistent scheme of human development through the transition from this mortal state into the glories of the heavenly world.

The author's treatment of his theme must challenge serious thought. He throws new light on difficult questions; he is abreast with the science of the day; he is devoutly reverent in his treat-

ment of the Scriptures; and he preserves intact every essential article of the Christian faith.

J. S. S.

Lancaster, Pa.

STUDIES IN THEOLOGY. Lectures delivered in Chicago Theological Seminary. By the Rev. James Denney, D.D. Second Edition. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1895. Price, \$1.50.

This is a noteworthy volume. The lectures, of which it is made up, were delivered in April, 1894, to the Chicago Theological Seminary, and attracted much attention at the time of their delivery. The author of them does not claim that they amount to a system of theology; but he believes they are consistent with each other, and would find their place in a system. The subjects discussed in them are: The Idea of Theology; The Witness of Jesus to Himself; The Apostolic Doctrine of Christ; Man and Sin; Christ in His Exaltation; The Church and the Kingdom of God; Holy Scripture, and Eschatology. The treatment of all these subjects is very masterly. Dr. Denney throughout shows himself thoroughly acquainted with the older and the newer theology, and fully able to appreciate the merits and see the defects of both. His criticisms are acute and convincing, and the conclusions at which he arrives are sound. In accordance with the Catholic faith he maintains that "Jesus was the Son of God in a peculiar and unique sense: this was how He conceived Himself, and this is fundamentally how we have to conceive Him." He also holds that death "is not the debt of nature, but the wages of sin. What might have been the line in which man's destiny would have been fulfilled had sin not entered into the world, and death by sin, no one can tell; but the fact that man is constituted for immortality, and has the promise of it, in his being from the first, forbids us to ascribe to death a natural and inevitable place in his career. It is an intrusion, and it is to be finally abolished." Of the death of Christ he says: "To separate out what we call the *spirit* of His death, and say that the virtue of it lies in that, and not in the mere abstract fact of dying, or in the death as a merely physical occurrence, is to draw distinctions which the Apostles did not draw, and to miss in doing so the very nerve of their gospel." Of the claim of some that St. Paul entertained the idea of a new body to be assumed, not at the day of judgment, but in the very instant of death, he says: "I believe this is a misinterpretation, and that St. Paul held from first to last the same faith, that the new body was a resurrection body, and was not put on till the judgment day." From these few extracts some idea of Dr. Denney's theological position may be formed. We commend his work to all our readers. No abler theological treatise has appeared for years. In its less than three hundred pages there is more sound theology presented, and in a clearer form, than in the greater number of far more pretentious works.

THE BOOK OF EZEKIEL. By the Rev. John Skinner, M.A., Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, Presbyterian College, London. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1895. Price, \$1.50.

In this volume Professor Skinner has endeavored to present the substance of Ezekiel's prophecies in a form intelligible to students of the English Bible. In this purpose he has admirably succeeded. Though his book has no pretensions to rank as a contribution to Old Testament scholarship, yet to the ordinary reader of the Bible it will prove of inestimable value. Ezekiel is often obscure by reason of the strange things which he describes; and on this account the Jews, it is said, reckoned his prophecies among those portions of Scripture which were not allowed to be read before the age of thirty years. For the same reason, also, they are, with most Bible readers, less popular than those of the other prophets. Studied, however, in connection with this exposition of them, they will be found full of interest and instruction. The work is one, therefore, which should find a place in every Bible student's library. It is scarcely necessary to add that the volume belongs to the series known as "The Expositor's Bible," all the volumes of which are possessed of rare merit as helps to the right understanding of God's Word.

THE BOOK OF DANIEL. By F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S., Late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Archdeacon of Westminster. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1895. Price, \$1.50.

We have here another volume of "The Expositor's Bible," which is now rapidly approaching completion, and which, when completed, will furnish one of the most satisfactory expositions of the Sacred Scriptures which as yet has been offered to the public. This volume is both highly interesting and instructive. It could, indeed, scarcely be otherwise, inasmuch as it has been prepared by so distinguished an author as Dr. Farrar, whose scholarship is of a superior character and whose style of composition is always readable and attractive. The work itself is divided into three parts. Of these parts the first is introductory, and treats, in a clear and masterly manner, of the historic existence of the prophet Daniel; of the language, unity, moral element, general structure and theology of the book; of the peculiarities of the historical, apocalyptic and prophetic sections, and of the internal and external evidence of its authorship or origin. Part second presents a commentary on the historic section; and part third deals with the prophetic section of the book. In an appendix there are given approximate chronological tables, and a genealogical table of the Lagidæ, Ptolemies, and Seleucidæ.

Dr. Farrar maintains that the book has rightly been given a place in the canon, and that it is truly profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness. Its narrative parts, however, he holds, have very little historic worth; and its prophecies, he claims, only express the views and hopes of the

anonymous author who lived and wrote after the conquests of Alexander, and most probably in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes. While we are not prepared to accept as wholly satisfactory the conclusions at which he arrives, we are nevertheless free to admit that in our present state of knowledge many things seem to favor their correctness. Whether, however, the views of Dr. Farrar be accepted or not, the work will repay careful study.

THE PROBLEM OF RELIGIOUS PROGRESS. By Daniel Dorchester, D.D. Revised Edition with New Tables and Colored Diagrams. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. Price, \$2.75

This is an unusually interesting and valuable work. It was originally published thirteen years ago, and since then has had a wide sale. Lately the author has thoroughly revised it and brought its data down to the present year. He has also made important additions, including points of inquiry and discussion pertaining to the most recent phases of moral and social evolution. The work itself consists of four parts. The first treats of "Faith," the second of "Morals," and the third of "Spiritual Vitality." In the fourth part very complete "Statistical Exhibits" of religious progress throughout the world, and especially in the United States, are given. A large amount of important information bearing on the progress of religion is, accordingly, presented in the volume which is an octavo of nearly eight hundred pages. The conclusion to which his investigations have led the author is that "Christianity was never a greater working force in the common life of the race than at the present time."

We heartily commend the work to the attention of all our readers. Every minister and, indeed, every person interested in the progress of religion, will find it an exceedingly serviceable book to possess and have within easy reach.

THOUGHTS ON RELIGION. By the late George John Romanes, M. A., LL.D., F.R.S. Edited by Charles Gore, M. A., Canon of Westminster. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1895. Price, \$1.25.

The late George John Romanes, whose later thoughts on religion are set forth in this volume, occupied a distinguished place in contemporary biology. He was a many-sided scientific man of remarkable ability and clear-headedness. In early life he was a member of the Christian Church, but later his scientific studies caused him for a time to become an unbeliever. Near the close of his life, however, he was led back again by his studies towards Christianity, and just before his death he returned to that full, deliberate communion with the Church, which he had for many years been conscientiously compelled to forego. The thoughts on religion contained in the volume before us were written during the period of transition, and before he had as yet come to a full acceptance of the orthodox posi-

tion. They are embraced in two essays on the "Influence of Science on Religion," and in "Notes for a Work on a Candid Examination of Religion." The intellectual attitude towards Christianity expressed in them is described by his friend, Rev. Charles Gore, Canon of Westminster, as "(1) 'pure agnosticism' in the region of the scientific reason, coupled with (2) a vivid recognition of the spiritual necessity of faith, and of the legitimacy and value of its intuitions; (3) a perception of the positive strength of the historical and spiritual evidences of Christianity." These "Thoughts on Religion" will amply repay careful study. They are a proof of the truth of Bacon's saying: "A little philosophy inclineth a man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion." The following statements contained in them are especially striking: "It is much more easy to disbelieve than to believe;" and, "Unbelief is usually due to indolence, often to prejudice, and never a thing to be proud of."

THE GOSPEL OF BUDDHA. According to Old Records. Told by Paul Carus. Second Edition. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1895. Price, \$1.00.

In this volume Dr. Carus aims to present the life and doctrines of Buddha in the best form with the view of setting the reader a-thinking on the religious problems of to-day. He has accordingly treated the material contained in Buddhist religious writings in the same way as the Evangelists are supposed to have used the accounts of the life and teachings of Jesus current in their day. The result is a very interesting and attractive book which throws much light on the character and teachings of one of the world's greatest religious leaders. In reading over its pages one ceases to wonder that Buddha has exerted so great an influence over the hearts and minds of men. In his teachings it will be found there is much of truth and beauty showing that God has nowhere left Himself without witness. The careful reader, however, will also discover that as a whole the teachings of Buddha are not to be compared with those of Christ in whom alone is the full truth reached. Besides the Gospel of Buddha, the volume also contains a helpful and suggestive preface, a table of references showing the sources of the extracts contained in the body of the work and the parallelisms in the Gospels, a glossary of names and terms with a method of pronunciation, and a very complete index, all of which add greatly to its value and usefulness. Those interested in the study of religion will find the work a very desirable and serviceable one. Dr. Carus deserves thanks for preparing it.

LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE. By Professor William Marvel Nevin, LL.D. Edited by Rev. Theodore Appel, D.D., Lancaster, Pa.: Intelligencer Printing Office. 1895. Price, \$2.00.

William Marvel Nevin, LL.D., was for many years professor in Marshall, and Franklin and Marshall College. He was a very

genial, scholarly and gifted man, who was greatly respected by all who knew him, and especially beloved by all who sat under his instruction. In memory of him this volume has been prepared by action of the Alumni Association of the institution with which for so long a time he was connected. The lectures which make up the body of the volume cannot fail to prove exceedingly interesting to those who were students under Professor Nevin. They will remind them not only of their college days, but also revive their knowledge of the history of English literature. The general reader will also find these lectures of unusual interest and value, for they abound in important information presented in such a way as to make it more than ordinarily attractive. Besides the lectures on the history of English literature, the volume, which is a large octavo of over five hundred pages, also contains selections from other writings of the author, together with a brief sketch of his life. A fine portrait of Professor Nevin, moreover, is given as a frontispiece. On account of its excellence and remarkable cheapness this work should have an extensive sale, particularly among the members of the Reformed Church.

THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE: Discourses upon Holy Scripture. By Joseph Parker, D.D., Minister of the City Temple, Holborn Viaduct, London. Author of "Ecce Deus," "The Paraclete," etc., etc. Vol. XXVI. Romans—Galatians. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 30 Lafayette Place. 1895. Price, \$1.50.

This volume deals with the great Epistles of St Paul. It does so in the same brilliant and instructive manner that characterizes the other volumes of the series to which it belongs. Those who have found delight and edification in the study of the preceding volumes will be sure to do so in the study of this. One more volume will complete the series. As a whole the "People's Bible" is a remarkably able work, and is possessed of extraordinary homiletic value.